

POSTAGE, Paid in Advance, 4 Cts. per No. or 16 Cts. per Year.

# DANVILLE REVIEW:

• CONDUCTED BY

*In Association of Ministers.*

SEPTEMBER, 1863.

---

Φωτισαντος δε ζωην και ἀφθαρσίαν διὰ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου.

---

DANVILLE, KY.

PRINTED FOR THE ASSOCIATION AND SOLD BY

MOORE, WILSTACH, KEYS & CO.,

25 WEST FOURTH STREET,

CINCINNATI.

SOLELY ALSO BY WM. S. & A. MARTIN, PHILADELPHIA; ROBERT CARTER &  
BROTHERS, NEW YORK; LITTLE, BROWN & CO., BOSTON;  
KEITH & WOODS, ST. LOUIS; BIBLE AND  
TRACT HOUSE, BALTIMORE.

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1863, by JACOB COOPER, for the Association,  
in the Clerk's Office of the District Court for the Southern District of Ohio.

# CONTENTS.

	PAGE
I.—THE UNION AND THE CONSTITUTION, No. I. By Rev. Samuel J. Baird, D. D., - - -	345
II.—THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF 1863. By Rev. R. L. Stanton, D. D., - - -	370
III.—STUDIES ON THE BIBLE, No. V.— <i>Israel in the Wilderness.</i> By Rev. E. P. Humphrey, D. D., - - -	453
IV.—A PRACTICAL DISCOURSE ON CHRISTIAN BENEFICENCE: <i>The Bible Argument.</i> By a Contributor. - - -	483

---

Volumes I and II, of this work, may be obtained of the Publishers at \$2.00 per volume, or Volumes I, II, and III for the years 1861, 1862, and 1863, at \$6 for the set in numbers.







# DANVILLE REVIEW.

No. III.

---

SEPTEMBER, 1863.

---

## ART. I.—*The Union and the Constitution.*

IN what sense and to what extent the people of the United States are one, has heretofore been the subject merely of speculation among political theorists, and of the declamations of party leaders. But amid the throes of a convulsion which has shaken our Union to its center, and threatens to rend it asunder, and prostrate in ruin the temple of liberty which our fathers founded, in the presence of a gigantic conspiracy, avowedly resting on and sanctioned by the assumption that we are not one people, but many, leagued together in a confederacy of independent sovereignties—the question becomes one of the profoundest practical importance. “Let it never be forgotten,” says a recent political writer of eminence,\* “that we are one people and one nation *only so far as the Constitution makes us one*. Outside of that bond we are thirty-four people and thirty-four nations, none of which have any more right to interfere with the local laws and institutions of the rest than with the local laws and institutions of China and Brazil. The people of the States have a right, under the Constitution to defend their local laws and institutions by arms, if necessary, and it is the duty of the United States to uphold and aid them in the attempt. A war confined to such an object would not be rebellion, even though the United States were the aggressor.”

---

\* Amos Kendall, in the *National Intelligencer*, February 21, 1862.

That a war against the constitutional rights of any part of the Union would be treasonable, and that in such a case, resistance could not justly be stigmatized as rebellion, is certain; not because the Union is a confederated league of distinct nations, but because any violation of the Constitution, by whomsoever committed, is treason to the sovereignty of "the people of the United States" by whom the Constitution was "ordained and established;" while they who, loyally and in good faith, should maintain the integrity of the Constitution, and oppose its assailants, would occupy the position of faithful lieges and guardians of that sovereignty. But that the American people are a society composed of thirty-four distinct people and nations, is so far from being unquestionably true, that it would rather seem to be without support, whether by appeal to the common sense of men, to sound theoretical principles, or to the criterion of historical facts, the only decisive test on such a question.

In looking into the original sources of our national history, nothing is more manifest, nothing stands out with more distinctness upon the whole face of the record, than the fact that the Union existed prior alike to Constitution and Confederation; that, from the first movement of the colonies in the controversies which resulted in their independence, they all recognized that Union, and their duty of allegiance to it, as already existent realities, not by virtue of any act of voluntary league or confederacy on their part, but from the very manner of their origin and native relations to each other, and to the British crown and people. The Constitution did not create the Union. It only gave it organization and defined relations to the people and to the State governments.

Originally, the American colonies were integral parts of the British nation—the fountain of their blood, the land of their fathers and home of their brethren. They were identified in the common nationality, and subject, in all external relations and general interests, to the paramount authority of the king and parliament. In their migration to America they retained all the rights and privileges of native-born English freemen, and were organized in subordinate colonial governments for the protection and exercise of those rights, and management of local and municipal affairs. While thus re-

lated to Great Britain, the colonies, when first called together in council by the usurpations of parliament, found themselves united to each other, not only by the same ties of blood and nationality which bound them to Britain, but by the common sympathies, privations, and privileges of colonial life, by the joint inheritance of one common country, by the same experience of British aggressions, and by the united purpose to vindicate their native liberties, at every hazard.

When, in October, 1765, upon occasion of the stamp act, the first Continental Congress assembled in New York, the question arose, "Upon what ground shall we vindicate our liberties?" On the faith of our charters, or on the principles of natural rights?" "A *confirmation* of our essential and common rights as Englishmen," said Christopher Gadsden, of South Carolina, "may be pleaded from our charters safely enough. But any further dependence upon them may be fatal. We should stand upon the broad *common* ground of those natural rights that we all feel and know as men, and as descendants of Englishmen. *I wish the charters may not ensnare us, at last, by drawing different colonies to act differently in this great cause.* Whenever that is the case, all will be over with the whole. *There ought to be no New England man, no New Yorker, known on the continent, but all of us Americans.*"\* These views were universally accepted, and the Congress, without any act of union, or even a resolve of mutual fidelity, proceeded as "Americans" to vindicate their violated rights, upon the general principles of English liberty.

To the king they "most respectfully shew," "that these colonies were originally planted by subjects of the British crown, who, animated with the spirit of liberty, encouraged by your majesty's royal predecessors, and confiding in the public faith for the enjoyment of all the rights and liberties essential to freedom, emigrated from their native country to this continent, and by their successful perseverance in the midst of innumerable dangers and difficulties, together with a profusion of their blood and treasure, have happily added these vast and valuable dominions to the empire of Great Britain; that, for the enjoyment of these rights and liberties, several

---

\* Gadsden, in Bancroft, Vol. V, p. 335.

governments were early formed in the said colonies with full power of legislation, agreeable to the principles of the English Constitution."\*

To the House of Lords they represent, "that his majesty's liege subjects in his American colonies, though they acknowledge a due subordination to that august body, the British Parliament, are entitled, in the opinion of your memorialists, to all the inherent rights and liberties of the natives of Great Britain; and have, ever since the settlement of the said colonies, exercised those rights and liberties, as far as their local circumstances would permit."

Addressing the House of Commons they state that they "most sincerely recognize their allegiance to the crown, and acknowledge all due subordination to the Parliament of Great Britain, and should always retain the most grateful sense of their assistance and protection." Yet they submit, "whether there be not a material distinction, in reason and sound policy, at least, between the necessary exercise of parliamentary jurisdiction, in general acts for the amendment of the common law, and the regulation of trade and commerce through the whole empire, and the exercise of that jurisdiction by imposing taxes on the colonies."†

To the same effect, the House of Representatives of Massachusetts Bay, writing to Lord Camden, Jan. 29, 1768, state that "such are the local circumstances of the colonies, at the distance of a thousand leagues from the metropolis, and separated by a wide ocean, as will forever render a just and equal representation in the supreme legislature utterly impracticable. Upon this consideration it is conceived that his majesty's royal predecessors thought it equitable to form legislative bodies in America, as perfectly free as a subordination to the supreme legislation would admit of; that the inestimable right of being taxed only by representatives of their own free election, might be preserved and secured to their subjects here."‡

Such was the constitution of the colonies and their relation

---

\* Almon's "Prior Documents," London, 1777, pp. 32, 33.

† Ibid, pp. 32, 33.

‡ Ibid., p. 186.



to the paramount sovereignty of the British king and parliament. Organized under colonial governments, the jurisdiction of which, over all local and internal interests, was exclusive and sovereign, they were cheerfully subordinate to the supreme legislature and crown, in all matters of more general and national concern. The causes of grievance which separated them from Great Britain were not several and diverse, in the several different colonies, but one and the same, common to all, and as such recognized and met by them; not with independent counsels and separate actions, but with perfect unity and accord, by common counsels and the united energies of all, controlled and guided by "the Continental Congress."

The king and parliament properly represented a sovereignty which was not essentially in them, but in the people. Their colonial policy, sustained as it was by the British people, excluded the Americans from the rights and privileges of free-men and equals, and treated them as outcasts and aliens. In pursuing such a course the British authorities forfeited the prerogatives of sovereignty over the colonists, whom they thus constrained to discover, in that government and nation, strangers and enemies. The throne thus vacated was occupied by Congress, at first, as a provisional organ of the common expostulations of America and guardian of her liberties, and at length, as the rightful successor of the derelict monarch, the true and chosen representative of the sovereignty of the American people. The result, therefore, of that convulsion which rent asunder the British empire, was not a disintegration of the American portion. On the contrary, it induced in the colonists a more distinct appreciation of the fact and the value of their unity of origin, of nationality and of interests, and a cordial acquiescence in the necessary and essential conditions of continued union.

#### CONGRESS OF 1774.

These general ideas have been illustrated in the proceedings of the Congress of 1765. The repeal of the stamp act seemed to promise the return of harmony, but new and oppressive measures of arbitrary power soon revealed the design of the administration to reduce the colonists to a condition of abject vassalage. Again, a Congress was called together, and again

was the Union recognized and attested, not by formal resolution or articles of union or confederation, but by patriot voices, proclaiming it as a recognized fact, arising out of the very nature of their existence as British colonies, and the manner of the aggressions which assailed their common rights and liberties. Patrick Henry, urging the propriety of each respective colony having a voice in the deliberations of Congress, proportioned to its relative population and importance, exclaimed, "Government is dissolved, fleets and armies, and the present state of things show that government is dissolved. Where are your landmarks, your boundaries of colonies? We are in a state of nature. I did propose that a scale should be laid down. That part which was once Massachusetts Bay, and that part which was once Virginia, ought to have some weight.

\* \* \* \* The distinctions between Virginians, Pennsylvanians, New Yorkers and New Englanders, are no more. *I am not a Virginian, but an American.*"\* "At this unhappy period," said Congress, in an address to the inhabitants of the colonies, "we have been authorized and directed to meet and consult together, for the welfare of *our common country.*"†

Neither in the commissions and instructions of the delegates, nor in the steps taken by this body, is there any suggestion of the necessity or propriety of forming a union, or entering into a compact of alliance. But the pre-existence of the Union is recognized and assumed as an admitted and unquestionable antecedent and basis of all their measures. In the commissions given by the colonies of New Hampshire and Maryland, their delegates are instructed to consult and act "for the redress of American grievances." In those of Massachusetts and South Carolina, it is for "the recovery and establishment of American rights and liberties." The other delegates had instructions equally national in their character, and in the same spirit were all the deliberations of the body and the steps adopted.

Addressing themselves to the inhabitants of the province of Quebec, a people separated from them by national origin, by language, manners and habits, and by geographical barriers,

---

\* John Adams' Diary Works, Vol. II, p. 366.

† Journal of Congress, Oct. 21, 1774.

Congress assures them, "We do not ask you, by this address, to commence acts of hostility against the government of our common sovereign. We only invite you to consult your own glory and welfare, and not to suffer yourselves to be inveigled or intimidated by infamous ministers, so far as to become the instruments of their cruelty and despotism; but to unite with us in one social compact, formed on the generous principles of equal liberty, and cemented by such an exchange of beneficial and endearing offices as to render it perpetual. In order to complete this highly desirable union, we submit it to your consideration, whether it may not be expedient for you to meet together, in your several towns and districts, and elect deputies, who afterward meeting in Provincial Congress, may choose delegates to represent your province in the Continental Congress, to be held in Philadelphia, on the 10th day of May, 1775," etc.\*

On the 20th of October, Congress adopted certain articles, which have sometimes been incorrectly represented as terms of confederation. The resolutions under which they were adopted, and the articles themselves, alike show that such was neither their design nor nature. The committee by whom they were reported, was appointed to draft articles of agreement for non-importation, non-consumption, and non-exportation, as between America and England. And the articles, after an enumeration of British aggressions, state that "To obtain redress of these grievances, which threaten destruction to the lives, liberty, and property of his majesty's subjects in North America, we are of opinion that a non-importation, non-consumptive, and non-exportation agreement, faithfully adhered to, will prove the most speedy, effectual and peaceable measure: and, therefore, we do for ourselves and the inhabitants of the several colonies whom we represent, firmly agree and associate under the sacred ties of virtue, honor, and love of our country, as follows:

"*First.* That from and after the first day of December next, we will not import into British America, from Great Britain or Ireland, any goods, wares, or merchandise, whatsoever; or, from any other place any

---

\* Journals of Congress, Oct. 26, 1774.

such goods, wares, or merchandise, as shall have been exported from Great Britain or Ireland; nor will we, after that day, import any East India tea from any part of the world; nor any molasses, syrups, paneles, coffee, or piemento, from the British plantations, or from Dominica, nor wines from Madeira or the Western Islands, nor foreign indigo.

"*Second.* That we will neither import nor purchase any slave imported after the first day of December next; after which time we will wholly discontinue the slave trade, and will neither be concerned in it ourselves, nor will we hire our vessels, nor sell our commodities and manufactures to those who are concerned in it."

After other articles of a similar nature, it is agreed, "that a committee be chosen in each county, city, and town, by those who are qualified to vote for representatives in the Legislature, whose business it shall be to attentively observe the conduct of all persons, touching this association; and whenever it shall be made to appear, to the satisfaction of a majority of any such committee, that any person within the limits of his appointment has violated this association, that such majority do forthwith cause the truth of the case to be published in the Gazette, to the end that all such foes to the rights of British America may be publicly known and universally contemned as the enemies of American liberty; and henceforth we will respectfully break off all dealings with him or her.

"And we do further agree and resolve, that we will have no trade, commerce, dealings, or intercourse whatever, with any colony or province in North America, which shall not accede to, or which shall hereafter violate this association, but will hold them as unworthy of the rights of freemen and inimical to the liberties of this country."

Thus it appears that these articles were so far from proposing to originate a union among the colonies, they pre-suppose its existence, and assert for its representatives the highest and most unquestionable right to the reverence and obedience of each colony and every individual. Under the modest guise of recommendations and articles of association, are couched provisions more stringent, in many respects, than those of the embargo which, a generation later, had almost excited New England to open rebellion; provisions ordained by the sole authority of the general Congress, vindicated by "the love of

our country," promulgated for the defense of "American liberty;" and enforced by a decree of outlawry and a doom of infamy against the recusant, whether individual or colony.

#### CONGRESS OF 1775.

A few days after the adoption of this measure, Congress adjourned until the 10th of May following, expecting, after so long a recess, to have the means of knowing the effect of their proceedings upon the English government. When the delegates again convened, the battle of Lexington had already been fought, and at the dawn of the very day upon which Congress re-assembled, the mountaineers of New Hampshire, with Ethan Allen at their head, had surprised Ticonderoga, and "in the name of the great Jehovah, and of the Continental Congress," planted their flag on the walls of that important post. General Gage was beleaguered in Boston by the courageous yeomanry of New England, called from their plows by the sounds of conflict at Lexington and Concord. The Provincial Congress of Massachusetts had already adopted measures for assembling an army of 30,000 enlisted men, of which that province proposed to furnish 13,600; while appeal was made to New Hampshire, Connecticut, and Rhode Island for the rest. Over these forces Massachusetts had placed General Artemas Ward.

In such circumstances decisive measures were imperatively incumbent upon Congress. In a somewhat similar case the Congress of the Southern States, at Montgomery, acting on the State Rights theory, proceeded in the first place to enter into articles of confederation; then, with the concurrence of the States of South Carolina and Alabama respectively, to adopt the armies which were besieging Forts Sumter and Pickens. Not till these preliminaries had been attended to, did the Confederate Congress pretend to a right or attempt to exercise the prerogative of appointing commanders and exercising control over those forces.

Such, however, was not the theory nor the course of action of the Continental Congress of 1775. Conscious of a unity, essential in its nature, and of an authority and power superior to any that compacts or confederations could create, it pro-

ceeded under that sanction alone to exercise, without hesitation or challenge, the highest functions of sovereignty over the colonies and their armies.

It is indeed stated by a popular but inaccurate writer and historian, that this Congress, after having adopted an humble address to the king, "in the face of it, went on to assume and exercise the powers of a sovereign authority. A federal union was formed, leaving to each colony the right of regulating its internal affairs, according to its own individual constitution; but vesting in Congress the power of making peace and war; of entering into treaties and alliances; of regulating general commerce; in a word, of legislating on all such matters as regarded the security and welfare of the whole community. The executive power was to be vested in a council of twelve, chosen by Congress from among its own members, and to hold office for a limited time. \* \* \* Congress lost no time in exercising their federated powers. In virtue of them they ordered the enlistment of troops," etc.\*

The only part of this account which has any foundation in fact, is the statement that "Congress went on to assume and exercise the powers of a sovereign authority." The particulars stated as to the terms of the "Federal Union," are taken, with one exception, from the "Articles of the Confederation," which were not adopted until the 15th of November, 1777—two years and a half subsequent to the time to which Irving transfers them. Search will be made in vain for any trace of the compact here described, in the records of the Congress of 1775. Abundant evidence, however, presents itself of the conscious possession and energetic exercise of sovereignty over the colonies.

On the 7th of June it was resolved, "that Thursday, the 20th of July next, be observed throughout the twelve United Colonies, as a day of humiliation, fasting, and prayer." In this resolution, the title "UNITED COLONIES," first occurs on the records of Congress, and was thenceforward used as the official style of revolted America. A few days afterward, measures were adopted for a general enlistment of twelve-months volunteers in "the American continental army." At the same

---

\* Irving's Washington, ch. xxxix.



time it was "Resolved, that a general be appointed to command all the continental forces raised, or to be raised, for the defense of American liberty; that five hundred dollars per month be allowed for the pay and expenses of the general." "The Congress then proceeded to the choice of a general, and George Washington, Esq., was unanimously elected."\*

Such was the style of original and unquestioned prerogative in which Congress did not so much assert as exercise a sovereign control over the forces of Massachusetts and the New England colonies, superseding the general whom they had commissioned, and placing Washington in command of all the forces "raised or to be raised," by whatsoever authority, for the defense of American liberty.

Together with his commission, Washington received a declaration to be published at the head of his army, upon assuming the command. "We are reduced," says Congress in this document, "to the alternative of choosing an unconditional submission to the tyranny of irritated ministers, or resistance by force. The latter is our choice. We have counted the cost of this contest, and find nothing so dreadful as voluntary slavery. Honor, justice, and humanity forbid us tamely to surrender that freedom which we received from our gallant ancestors, and which our innocent posterity have a right to receive from us. We can not endure the infamy and guilt of resigning succeeding generations to that wretchedness which inevitably awaits them, if we basely entail hereditary bondage upon them. Our cause is just. Our union is perfect. Our internal resources are great, and, if necessary, foreign assistance is undoubtedly attainable. \* \* \* In our native land, in defense of the freedom that is our birthright, and which we enjoyed, till the late violation of it; for the protection of our property, acquired solely by the honest industry of our forefathers and ourselves, against violence actually offered, we have taken up arms. We shall lay them down when hostilities shall cease on the part of the aggressors, and all dangers of their being renewed shall be removed, and not before."

---

\* Journal of Congress, June 14, 1775.

In the exercise of the same sovereignty which assumed the control of the army, Congress now also established a general post office, with Franklin at the head, and issued bills of credit for the expenses of the war, to the amount of two millions of dollars; which was afterward from time to time increased a hundredfold. These bills were inscribed "THE UNITED COLONIES OF AMERICA," the faith of which was pledged for their redemption.

Another subject that early claimed the attention of this Congress, was the disorganized condition of the colonies, consequent upon the dissolution of the royal governments. On the 2nd of June, a letter was received from the Provincial Convention of Massachusetts Bay, asking "explicit advice respecting the taking up and exercising the powers of civil government," and declaring their readiness "to submit to such a general plan as the Congress may direct for the colonies, or make it their great study to establish such a form of government there as shall not only promote their advantage, but *the union and interest of all America*." In reply, it was resolved that in order to conform as near as may be to the spirit and substance of the charter, it be recommended to the Provincial Convention to write letters to the inhabitants of the several places which are entitled to representation in assembly, requesting them to choose such representatives, and that the assembly, when chosen, do elect councillors, and that such assembly or council exercise the powers of government until a governor, of his majesty's appointment, will consent to govern according to the charter."\*

Similar applications were afterward received from South Carolina, New Hampshire and Virginia, to all of whom answer was given in identical terms, "that if the convention of South Carolina shall find it necessary to establish a form of government in that colony, it be recommended to that convention to call a full and free representation of the people, and that the said representatives, if they think it necessary, shall establish such a form of government as, in their judgment, will produce the happiness of the people, and most effectually secure peace and good order in the colony during

---

\* Journals of Congress, 1776, June 2 and 9.

the continuance of the present dispute between Great Britain and the colonies."\*

The Provincial Congress of Georgia but expressed the common sentiment when, while about to organize a temporary system, it declares that "before any general system or form of government can be concluded upon, it is necessary that application be made to the Continental Congress for their advice and directions upon the same."†

At length, a general recommendation was adopted, May 10, 1776, in the words:

"*Resolved*, That it be recommended to the respective Assemblies and Conventions of the United Colonies, where no government sufficient to the exigencies of their affairs hath been hitherto established, to adopt such government as shall, in the opinion of the representatives of the people, best conduce to the happiness and safety of their constituents in particular, and America in general."

A preamble to this resolution was adopted, a few days after, declaring it "absolutely irreconcilable with reason and good conscience for the people of these colonies now to take the oaths and affirmations necessary for the support of any government under the crown of Great Britain, and that it was necessary that the exercise of any kind of authority under the crown should be totally suppressed, and all the powers of government exerted, under the authority of the people of the colonies, for the preservation of their peace, and their defense against their enemies."‡

"The preamble and resolves of Congress," says Bancroft, "were, in themselves, the act of a self-determining body."§ They were predicated upon a state of sentiment in the colonies, which elicited the publication of Paine's "Common Sense," in which, among other things, he proposes a plan for the organization of state governments. It was published in the winter of 1775-6; and of it John Adams says, in his Diary, "I regretted to see so foolish a plan recommended to

---

\* Journal of Congress, 1775 Oct. 18, Nov. 8, 4, Dec. 2, 4.

† Steven's History of Georgia, Vol. II, p. 292.

‡ Journal of Congress, May 10 and 15, 1776.

§ Bancroft, Vol. VIII, p. 384.

the people of the United States, who were all *waiting only for the countenance of Congress to institute state governments.*"\* Adams, therefore, published a pamphlet on the subject, the plan of which being followed by some of the colonies, while that of Paine was adopted by others; all were soon organized into governments independent of the crown.

Thus, when the matter is traced, it appears that, so far from the Union being a product of compact between the States, the reverse is true—that the state governments which superseded those appointed by the crown, were established under the advice and authority of the Congress of the Union. It was not until encouraged by the recommendation above cited that South Carolina herself ventured to throw off the shackles of the colonial form of government, and organize a provisional system, which, upon the declaration of independence, was again replaced by a permanent state constitution.

In Pennsylvania and Maryland, the preamble and resolutions of Congress were recognized by the people as having the effect to dissolve the proprietary governments which still existed in those colonies; and they immediately took measures to supply the vacuum so created, by the organization of new institutions—established, in Maryland, through the intervention of the committee of safety, and in Pennsylvania, by the spontaneous assembling of a popular convention which superseded the colonial government.

#### INDEPENDENCE.

While these various measures were being adopted by the United Colonies, the lingering hope was still cherished, that the British ministry would yet return to pacific counsels, and the broken ties of affection and allegiance be reunited. Amid the conflict and bloodshed of the year, all such hopes and wishes were extinguished, and on the 8th of June, 1776, "resolutions respecting independency" were referred to the committee of the whole Congress. On the 10th, it was resolved, "That the consideration of the first resolution be postponed to Monday, the first day of July next; and, in the meanwhile, that no time be lost, in case the Congress agree

---

\* Works of J. Adams, Vol. II, p. 507.

thereto, that a committee be appointed to prepare a declaration, to the effect of the said first resolution."

In the interval of this postponement, on the 25th, "a declaration of the deputies of Pennsylvania, met in provincial conference, was laid before Congress and read, expressing their willingness to concur in a vote of Congress, declaring the United Colonies free and independent States." On the 28th, from New Jersey, and on the 1st of July, from Maryland, similar communications were received. These communications were made for the purpose of relieving the delegates of those colonies from instructions previously given, which had prohibited them from joining in any step tending to independence. On the 2d of July, the resolution was "agreed to,"—"That these United Colonies are, and of right, ought to be, free and independent States; that they are absolved from all allegiance to the British crown, and that all political connexion between them and the State of Great Britain, is, and ought to be, totally dissolved."

On the 4th, the declaration was adopted and signed; in which, after a rehearsal of grievances and of unsuccessful expostulations, Congress states that "We, therefore, the representatives of the United States of America, in General Congress assembled, appealing to the Supreme Judge of the world for the rectitude of our intentions, do, *in the name and by the authority of the good people of these Colonies*, solemnly publish and declare, That these *United Colonies* are, and of right ought to be, free and independent States; that they are absolved from all allegiance to the British crown, and that all political connexion between them and the State of Great Britain is, and ought to be, totally dissolved; and that, as free and independent States, they have full power to levy war, conclude peace, contract alliances, establish commerce, and to do all other acts and things which independent States may do. And, for the support of this declaration, with a firm reliance on the protection of Divine Providence, we mutually pledge to each other our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor."

That this declaration was an act of the most eminent power, implying a claim to supreme prerogative and sovereignty, is manifest. Its decree was alike momentous in its

bearing upon the authority of king and parliament, and the relations and destinies of the empire and the colonies. By it, the king was dethroned. In the exercise of a paramount power, it deposed the parliament from that supreme control over the general external relations of the colonies which that body had hitherto possessed. It dismembered the empire. The colonies it cut off from their former relations of union and fealty, and decreed the transfer of their allegiance to another sovereign—the Continental Congress itself—whose absolute authority could not be more signally asserted than in these measures, nor more clearly acknowledged by the colonies than by their cheerful acquiescence, and zealous execution of them.

Several points in this transaction have a very signal bearing upon the question of the original and unbroken unity of this nation—the primitive and constant subordination of the states to the central authority.

1. A step so momentous was taken by the Continental Congress without recurrence to the provincial governments in any form, whether for advice or authority. The colonies of Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Maryland, were the only ones from whom any expression on the subject was received; and that was unsought, was subsequent, and, suggested by the introduction of the question in Congress, was designed to relieve their own delegates from restrictions previously imposed, and was couched in the modest form of acquiescence in whatever Congress might determine on the subject.

2. The declaration does not even purport to speak in the name of the colonies, whether severally or as a confederation; nor in the name of the people of the several colonies or states. But it is "the representatives of the United States, in Congress assembled," speaking "in the name and by the authority of the *good people* of these Colonies," "these United Colonies."\* Those who are aware of the accuracy of the

---

\* The incongruous transition from "states" to "colonies," in this place, crept in in the process of amendment. The original draft by Jefferson was in these words: "We, therefore, the representatives of the United States of America, in General Congress assembled, do, in the name and by the authority of the good people of these States, reject and renounce all allegiance and subjection to the kings of Great Britain, and all others who may hereafter claim



political studies of our revolutionary fathers, the clearness of their views, as to the respective sources and boundaries of political authority, prerogative and privilege, and the critical attention given to these points in the composition of all their public documents—and of this above all others—will need no assurance that the precise significance of this language was fully appreciated by the author and signers of the declaration. Of this, abundant illustrations will hereafter appear.

3. The States of the Union, severally, did not pass separate decrees of independence; and, except so far as the representatives of the Union had the right and authority to bind them, their relation of dependence on Great Britain has never been dissolved by any public or official act. But, certainly, a decree such as this, assuming thus to control and determine the allegiance of the States, was an assertion of paramount sovereignty over them, which, unless approval was intended, as much demanded acts of independence on their part, severally, as did the aggressions of parliament on the part of the Union. It need not be proved that any attempt at such an independence would have been held in universal abhorrence.

"I do not believe," says Jefferson, "there ever has been a whig, in any one State, who would not have shuddered at the very idea of a separation of their State from the confederacy. The tories would, at all times, have been glad to see the confederacy dissolved, even by particles at a time, in hopes of their attaching themselves again to Great Britain."

4. The declaration in express terms, forbids the idea, that its design was to give the colonies several independence of each other. That document was dictated by a "decent respect to the opinions of mankind." To mankind it is addressed, and

---

by, through, or under them; we utterly dissolve all political connection which may heretofore have existed between us and the people, or parliament of Great Britain; and finally, we do assert and declare these Colonies to be free and independent States, and that, as free and independent States, they have full power to levy war, conclude peace, contract alliances, establish commerce, and to do all other acts and things which independent States may of right do. And for the support of this declaration, we mutually pledge to each other our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor."

its design is, on the face of it, declared to be, to show the causes which made it "necessary for *one people* to dissolve the political bands which have connected them with *another*, and to assume among the powers of the earth *the separate and equal station* to which the laws of nature and of nature's God entitle them." The tribunal at which the declaration is thus presented—the nations of Europe—had known "The United Colonies" by the history of a conflict carried through years of controversy, negotiations, and war. They had heard the voice of Washington, on assuming command of the continental armies, declare in the name of the Congress of these United Colonies, "Our cause is just. *Our union is perfect*. Our internal resources are great; and, if necessary, foreign assistance is undoubtedly attainable." They had seen the perfection of that union verified by the whole history of the war, and attested by the presence of secret agents from United America at every important court in Europe. In these circumstances, the language could have but one meaning and intention, when "these United Colonies" are declared to be free and independent States. It proclaimed the inauguration, not of thirteen nations, but of "one people," in a "separate and equal station," among the powers of the earth.

The style of the epoch whence the subsequent acts of Congress date, as illustrated in the preamble, and again in the ratification of the very articles of confederation, has a bearing on the present point, which needs no comment. "Whereas, the delegates of the United States of America, did, on the 15th day of November, in the year of our Lord, 1777, and in the second year of *Independence of America*, agree to certain articles," etc. "Done at Philadelphia, in the State of Pennsylvania, the 9th day of July, in the year of our Lord 1778, and in the third year of the *Independence of America*."

Should any embarrassment to the conclusion here attained be supposed to arise from the plural form of the phrase "Independent States," the same objection applies to the name of the Union as it now exists, "the United States." The suggestion is without force in itself, and is utterly insignificant, in view of the points here developed. In fact, the declaration does not purport, and was not designed to define the relations of the States to each other, but to announce the new relation

which they then in common assumed to Great Britain, and the other powers of the earth.

#### ARTICLES OF CONFEDERATION.

Until the Declaration of Independence, all the measures of the colonies contemplated the hope of a restoration of the old relations to the British government. In this view, Congress itself was regarded as a merely temporary expedient. To obviate, therefore, as far as possible, any jealousy which its existence might induce in Great Britain, and avoid the appearance of arriving at permanence and independence, that body had heretofore cautiously abstained from the organization of a regular form of government for the United Colonies. Its own powers were undefined, and its relations to the provincial governments unascertained. With the new order of things, new arrangements became necessary. Says Ramsey, himself a patriot of the era of the revolution, a delegate from South Carolina to the Continental Congress, and for a year president of that body, "the rejection of the British sovereignty not only involved a necessity of erecting independent institutions, but of cementing the whole United States by some common bond of union. The act of independence did not hold out to the world thirteen sovereign States, but a common sovereignty of the whole in their united capacity. It, therefore, became necessary to run the line of distinction between the local legislatures and the assembly of the States in Congress."\* On the same day, therefore, on which the committee was nominated to draft the declaration (the 11th of June), it was resolved, "that a committee be appointed to prepare and digest the form of a confederation to be entered into between these colonies."

The labors of this committee and the action of Congress on the subject, were greatly embarrassed by circumstances incident to the unexpected manner in which the struggle with England had ended in independence, and which seriously threatened to convert their independence of England into a disintegration of the colonies, and involving consequent weakness, anarchy, or ultimate re-subjugation under the royal

---

\* Ramsey's History of the Revolution, ch. XIII.

allegiance. Had independence been the original aim, it would have been easy at first for Congress to organize a general government fully adequate to the emergency, and no question of local jealousy, interest, or authority would have prevented a cordial and general acquiescence in the assumption and exercise by the central government of whatever functions or powers were necessary to the utmost efficiency, and the full development of all the resources of the colonies. The instructions of the people of Hanover, in commissioning Patrick Henry as their delegate to the provincial convention of Virginia in 1774, was the common sentiment of all: "We recommend the adoption of such measures as may produce the hearty union of all our countrymen and sister colonies. United, we stand; divided, we fall. To attain this wished-for union, we declare our readiness to sacrifice any lesser interest arising from a soil, climate, situation, and productions peculiar to us."\*

But such was not the course pursued. Congress, still hoping for re-union with England, and maintaining the controversy with her solely in defense of the rightful authority of the colonial governments over their internal affairs—the measures adopted, both by it and by the several colonies, tended to strengthen and fortify the subordinate authorities, and concentrate all power in them, for the ultimate security of their liberties, in case of reconciliation. But no proportionate means were used to strengthen the general government in the hands of Congress, which all regarded as a provisional expedient, that could not survive the return of peace. As a consequence, the Declaration of Independence found the general government without organization; without executive or judiciary; without defined powers; without revenue or resources; habitually acting through the provincial authorities and depending on them for men and means, for all the appliances, whether of government or war. On the other hand, the provincial governments were thoroughly organized, and held efficient control over the whole resources of the country. At the same time, the importunate applications which a helpless Congress was constrained by the public necessities, to urge on these

---

\* Wirt's *Life of Patrick Henry*, p. 90.

governments, brought into continual contrast the weakness of the one and strength of the other.

To these causes are to be added, the natural proclivities of power to aggrandizement; and the disposition, which had grown into a general and confirmed habit—from causes just mentioned—to magnify the importance of the provincial governments. It is not, therefore, surprising that a powerful tendency was manifested in the State authorities to claim an almost absolute supremacy, instead of that sovereignty over local and internal affairs which was proper to them, and in defense of which, the war occurred. Disloyalty to the Union did not exist. All were agreed as to the propriety and necessity of maintaining its integrity inviolate. But many were disposed to attribute such prerogatives to the individual States as were, practically, incompatible with the efficient existence of a central government. These tendencies were confirmed and strengthened by mistaken inferences drawn from the fact that, sustained by the ardor of public patriotism, Congress had been able, by the exertion of a moral power alone, to meet every emergency, and to provide for the exigencies of the struggle, until independence had now been attained.

The committee on "a form of confederation" reported July 12th. Their work was considered in Committee of the Whole, until the 8th of August. It then lay till the following April, when it was again taken up and discussed, from time to time, and on the 15th of November, at length adopted and sent to the States for their sanction. It was not until the 9th day of July, 1778, "and in the third year of the independence of America," that having been approved by the States, it was finally ratified and signed in Congress. By New Jersey, however, it was not adopted until the 26th of November, nor by Delaware until the 12th of February, 1779, and Maryland withheld her concurrence until the 1st of March, 1781.

The delay which took place in drawing up and adopting the plan of confederation was not favorable to the vigor of the system therein embodied. Mr. James Wilson, of Pennsylvania, in the constitutional convention, remarked, that "among the first sentiments expressed in the first Congress, one was that 'Virginia is no more, that Massachusetts is no more, that Pennsylvania is no more, etc. We are now one

nation of brethren—we must bury all local interests and distinctions.’ This language continued for some time. The tables at length began to turn. No sooner were the state governments formed, than their jealousy and ambition began to display themselves. Each endeavored to cut a slice from the common loaf to add to its own morsel, till at length the Confederation became frittered down to the impotent condition in which it now stands. Review the progress of the Articles of Confederation through Congress, and compare the first and the last draught of it.”\*

The document, as finally adopted, was entitled, “Articles of Confederation and perpetual union between the States of New Hampshire, Massachusetts Bay, Rhode Island and Providence Plantations, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Maryland, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Georgia.” According to the terms of these articles, “Each State retains its own sovereignty, freedom and independence, and every power, jurisdiction and right, which is not, by this Confederation, delegated to the United States, in Congress assembled.”

To the Union were attributed, with one exception, all the functions peculiar to national sovereignty. “The United States, in Congress assembled,” were exclusively empowered “to levy war, conclude peace, contract alliances, regulate the alloy and value of coin, fix the standard of weights and measures, determine controversies between two or more States, and establish a post office and post roads.” Except the power “to establish commerce,” these include all those which were described in the Declaration of Independence as the prerogatives of independent States, and, as such, claimed for the United States. These powers had heretofore been exercised by Congress, and by it alone; from the first day of its sessions, in 1774—not only in all the earlier periods of the controversy, but after, as well as before, the Declaration of Independence. In fact, these, the prerogatives of independent national sovereignty, were never claimed nor exercised, for a single day, by any State of the Union, until the convention of South Carolina met in December, 1860, eighty-six years

---

\* Elliott's Madison's Debates, Vol. 172.



after the first meeting of the United Congress. The power to regulate commerce was not enumerated in the Articles. Says Ramsey, "As, at the time the Articles of Confederation were proposed for ratification, the Americans had little or no regular commercial intercourse with foreign nations, a power to regulate trade, or to raise revenue from it, though both were essential to the welfare of the Union, made no part of the federal system."\*

But while so many of the functions of national sovereignty were attributed to the Union, it was left without any adequate means to vindicate its authority, or give effect to its decrees. As its only source of revenue, "the United States, in Congress assembled," was empowered to assess and apportion a tax among the States. But the taxes thus distributed must "be laid and levied by the authority and direction of the legislatures of the several States." If these failed of their duty, no remedy was provided.

For the executive department, Congress was authorized to appoint "a '*Committee of the States*,' to consist of one delegate from each State; and to appoint such other committees and civil officers as may be necessary for managing the general affairs of the United States under their direction—to appoint one of their number to preside, provided that no person be allowed to serve in the office of president more than one year in any term of three years." The Committee of the States, or any nine of them, was authorized "to execute, in the recess of Congress, such of the powers of Congress, as the United States, in Congress assembled, by the consent of nine States, shall, from time to time, think expedient to vest them with; provided that no power be delegated to the said committee, for the exercise of which, by the Articles of Confederation, the voice of nine States, in Congress of the United States assembled, is requisite." The restriction here referred to provided that "the United States, in Congress assembled, shall never engage in a war, nor grant letters of marque and reprisal in time of peace, nor enter into any treaties or alliances, nor coin money, nor regulate the value thereof, nor ascertain the sums and expenses necessary for the defense and

---

\* History of the Revolution, ch. xiii.

welfare of the United States, or any of them, nor emit bills, nor borrow money on the credit of the United States, nor appropriate money, nor agree upon the number of vessels of war to be built or purchased, or the number of land or sea forces to be raised, nor appoint a commander-in-chief of the army or navy, unless nine States assent to the same."

A plan so imperfect, so fraught with evidence of State jealousy, and so adapted to bring the General Government into contempt, contained within itself the seeds of dissolution. That it was not regarded by its authors as the creation of a new Union or Confederacy, but the organization of that which already existed, is sufficiently attested by two facts, apart from all other evidence. The commission which Washington received from the Continental Congress, on the 17th of June, 1775, he bore unchanged—as well after as before the adoption of the Articles—until it was surrendered by him into the hands of the Confederate Congress, upon return of peace. Nor, in any other cases, were new commissions issued to the officers of the Union, as must have been done, had a new Confederacy or Union then first come into existence.

The other fact is, that, as already stated, the Articles of Confederation were not adopted by New Jersey and Delaware until several months after the ratification by the other States; nor by Maryland until more than two years later. Yet in no respect were the rights and prerogatives of these, as States of the Union, in the mean time, impaired, diminished, or even called in question.

On the contrary, while measures were taken to induce them to accept the Articles of Confederation, their relations as already constituent parts of the Union, were distinctly recognized. It was resolved, "that a committee of three be appointed to prepare a circular letter to the States in this Union that have not hitherto authorized their delegates in Congress to ratify the Confederation, informing such States how many and what States have already ratified the same; and desiring that such States will, with all convenient dispatch, authorize their delegates to ratify the Confederation in the Congress of the United States."\*

---

\* Journals of Congress, July 5, 1778.

The letter was written, and the States all at length acceded to the Articles. But in the mean time, there was neither interruption nor question as to the continued competence and right of the non-subscribers to enjoy and exercise their previous equal authority and control in all the business of Congress and affairs of the Union.

#### VOICE OF WASHINGTON.

On the 23d of December, 1783, peace having been restored, and the independence of America formally acknowledged by the British Government, Washington resigned his commission into the hands of Congress. His name suggests a question of no little interest and significance as bearing on the present subject. To what interest, and in whose cause, did he and his armies unsheathe the sword? Was it in behalf of a throng of petty nations? or, in defense of the rights and liberties of one country, one nation and people? His response is given in the address with which, upon this occasion, he resigned the command—a response worthy of “the father of his country:”

“The great events on which my resignation depended, having at length taken place, I have now the honor of offering my sincere congratulations to Congress, and of presenting myself before them, to surrender into their hands the trust committed to me, and to claim the indulgence of retiring from *the service of my country*. Happy in the confirmation of our independence and sovereignty, and pleased with the opportunity afforded the United States of becoming a *respectable nation*, I resign, with satisfaction, the appointment I accepted with diffidence; a diffidence in my abilities to accomplish so arduous a task; which, however, was superseded by a confidence in the rectitude of our cause, the support of *the Supreme Power of the Union*, and the patronage of Heaven. The successful termination of the war has verified the most sanguine expectations; and my gratitude for the interposition of Providence, and the assistance I have received *from my countrymen*, increases with every review of the momentous contest.

“While I repeat my obligations to the army in general, I should do injustice to my own feelings not to acknowledge, in this place, the peculiar and distinguished merits of the gentlemen who have been attached to my person during the war. It was impossible the choice of confidential officers to compose my family should have been more fortunate.

Permit me, sir, to recommend, in particular, those who have continued in the service to the present moment, as worthy of the favorable notice and patronage of Congress.

"I consider it an indispensable duty to close this last act of my official life, by commending the interests of our *dearest country* to the protection of Almighty God, and those who have the superintendence of them to His holy keeping. Having now finished the work assigned me, I retire from the great theater of action; and bidding an affectionate farewell to this august body, under whose orders I have long acted, I here offer my commission, and take my leave of all the employments of public life."

So spake George Washington, in the presence of Congress, sitting under the provisions of the Articles of Confederation. Even then, the dream of our plural nationality found no harbor in his clear and discriminating mind. In the same spirit was the response of Congress:

"The United States in Congress Assembled, receive, with emotions too affecting for utterance, the solemn resignation of the authorities under which you have led their troops with success, through a perilous and doubtful war. Called upon by *your country* to defend its invaded rights, you accepted the sacred trust, before it had formed alliances, and while it was without friends, *or a government to support you*. \* \* \* \* \* We join you in commending the interests of our dearest country to the protection of Almighty God, beseeching him to dispose the hearts and minds of its citizens to improve the opportunity afforded them of becoming a happy and respectable nation." \*

---

#### ART. II.—*The General Assembly of 1863.*

THE proceedings of the supreme judicatory of our Church, at its annual convocation, are of so much interest to the whole body represented in it, for the time present and to come, that it has long been deemed best to give a somewhat different, if not more durable, form to the more important

matters under consideration, than they are likely to receive in the reports of the daily or weekly press.

In the review we propose of the transactions of the General Assembly recently held, we shall notice the chief subjects acted upon, with a sketch of some of the discussions, taking for our guide the account of the proceedings found in several different papers, and the official reports made to the Assembly. At the time we write (June, immediately after the rising of the Assembly, and before the printing of the official minutes), we have access to no other means of information. For the opinions we express, we are of course alone responsible.

It is not important, in the manner of our review, that the business of the Assembly should be noticed in the precise order, chronologically, in which it was transacted.

#### OPENING SERVICES.

The General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States met by appointment in the First Presbyterian Church in Peoria, Illinois, on the 21st day of May, 1863. This was the seventy-fifth annual meeting of the body. Its sessions were opened with a sermon by the Rev. Charles C. Beatty, D. D., Moderator of the last Assembly, from Ephesians, iv: 7: "But unto every one of us is given grace, according to the measure of the gift of Christ."

This discourse has been published in full, and we have read it with interest. It is a sound, practical exhibition of certain characteristics of the Church—as unity, completeness, stability, symmetry, and progress—and breathes, throughout, the spirit of brotherly kindness and charity. Its wide circulation will do great good.

#### NUMBER OF MEMBERS.

After these devotional services, the Standing Committee of Commissions presented the roll, from which it appears that there were present two hundred and fifty ministers and ruling elders. As the roll was printed early in the sessions, it is probable that the complete official minutes, as usual, will show a still larger number in actual attendance. Even as it now appears from the list before us, the number present was

six more than all who attended at Columbus, Ohio, in 1862, and only fourteen less than attended in Philadelphia, in 1861. At the last named meeting, certain Presbyteries in the Synods of Virginia, Nashville, Memphis, Mississippi, and Texas, were represented, wholly or in part, by sixteen members. Deducting this number (as none of the Presbyteries in these Synods have been represented since 1861), and it appears that the meeting in Peoria was larger than the one last held in Philadelphia.

This exhibits the important facts—that our Church, notwithstanding the schism occasioned by the withdrawal of Presbyteries and Synods in the revolted States, had been making steady and healthful progress; and the wonderful advancement of our country in all the elements of substantial prosperity, as seen in the consideration that the larger of these two meetings was held in a thriving city of what was only a few years since a frontier State, and the smaller in a city, outside of which, it was deemed by some good people, not long ago, almost an unpardonable heresy to suppose the General Assembly could properly meet at all.

#### ORGANIZATION.

Rev. John H. Morrison, of the Presbytery of Lodiana, Northern India, who has been twenty-five years a devoted missionary to the heathen, was elected Moderator on the first ballot, having for his competitors, Dr. Nevin, of Philadelphia, Dr. Young, of Butler, Pa., and Dr. Wines, of New York. Besides the just tribute paid to the merits of the man and to the missionary cause in the bestowment of this honor, another feature of this election is worthy of a passing notice. The Moderator is not a D. D. Though published in several of the papers with this appendage to his name, the roll printed by the authority of the Assembly omits these formidable letters, while it carefully appends them to the name of each of the three clerks. We therefore conclude that the Moderator *had not yet* suffered this infliction. And yet he was chosen over three well-known doctors. We do not learn that any dissent was entered to this election. Let our untitled brethren take courage; their claims will not be overlooked.

Without in the least underrating the merits of the unsuc-

cessful candidates, we are decidedly pleased at this feature of the case. It is but the fifth instance of the kind out of seventy-five elections since the origin of the Assembly. The last of the four was in 1809, fifty-four years ago. We have sometimes seen in our judicatories titled merit pushed quite too far forward, and we therefore rejoice the rather at this action of the Assembly.

Rev. James H. Mason Knox, D. D., of the Second Presbytery of Philadelphia, was elected Temporary Clerk.

#### PERSONNEL OF THE ASSEMBLY.

Not to know some men may argue one's self unknown, as saith a great authority. But a glance at the roll fails to reveal the names, with a few exceptions, of those who are prominent in the Church, either as members of previous Assemblies or otherwise. Passing by the distinguished men of the extreme South, some of whom have been present in every Assembly, but the last two, for twenty years past, we do not discover the more noted men of the East, West, or Middle States, who have so often led the discussions of the Assembly, impressed their views upon its measures, and contributed so largely to shape the progress of our Church. A noticeable illustration of this is seen in the fact that Dr. Humphrey was the only member of the late Assembly who had ever been Moderator previous to Dr. Beatty, who was the Moderator of the Assembly next preceding. It has been quite unusual not to have in attendance, as members, a goodly number of men who have filled the chair in former Assemblies. There were four present in 1862, and three in 1861, while before the last named year, at least half a dozen might sometimes be counted.

But, judging from the reported discussions on some of the subjects canvassed and decided, the Assembly of 1863 was a body of men of marked ability. It occupied eleven days in its deliberations, a portion of the time holding three sessions a day, had a large number of judicial cases before it, and besides disposing of the business connected with the various Boards and Theological Seminaries, which is always of a very important character, and attending to the usual routine affairs



of the body, it determined some questions of as great moment as ordinarily come before any Assembly.

COMPLAINT OF DR. R. J. BRECKINRIDGE AND SIXTEEN OTHERS  
AGAINST THE SYNOD OF KENTUCKY, ON THE RIGHT OF SUP-  
FRAGE IN THE CHOICE OF PASTOR.

This was a case of very grave import, and had been pending a considerable time. The matters involved in it directly concern every particular congregation belonging to the Presbyterian Church in connection with the General Assembly, whether in our own land or upon heathen ground, which now has a pastor, or desires, or ever expects, to establish that relation; for it affects the pastoral *status* as such. And as "the pastoral office is the first in the Church, both for dignity and usefulness," according to our form of government, we can conceive of few questions of higher interest which can be submitted for the determination of a church court.

We watched the progress of this case through the late Assembly with more than ordinary solicitude. The time spent upon it shows its importance as viewed by the Assembly. It was taken up on the second day of the sessions, canvassed more or less for several days, and the final decision was not reached till the evening of the last day, just before the Assembly was dissolved.

The gravity of the issues involved, the judgment pronounced by our highest court, together with the interest which is naturally felt in the case by the churches in Kentucky, where it originated, incline us to devote to it a large space, and to give as full an account of it as our information will admit, and also the material portions of the debate it elicited in the Assembly.

Its history, as we learn, is this: It originated in certain questions addressed to the Presbytery of Louisville, in regard to the right of suffrage in the election of pastors, which were referred for answer to the Synod of Kentucky. The answer of this Synod was in effect that no persons are competent to vote in the election of pastor except those who are professors of religion, in full communion with, and contributing to, the support of the Church. From this decision, Dr. Breckinridge and sixteen others complained to the General Assembly.

Upon this complaint the case was first brought before the Assembly of 1861, and the Judicial Committee, of which Dr. Jacobus, of Allegheny Seminary, was chairman, recommended the following as the decision of the Assembly: "That, whereas the Form of Government does not exclude those from voting for a pastor who are members of the congregation, but not members of the Church, provided they have complied with the requirement in Form of Government, chap. xv, sec. 4; therefore, the protest and complaint be sustained, and the decision of the Synod be reversed." A motion to adopt this report was discussed at some length, when, on the next day, "Dr. Monfort moved, as a substitute for the report of the Committee, the following: '*Resolved*, That the complaint be dismissed, for the reason that it asks the Assembly to reverse an opinion delivered *en thesi*, and therefore not properly a cause of complaint.'" This resolution was considered on several different days, when finally the Assembly adopted the following: "*Resolved*, That inasmuch as there is now no sufficient time to discuss the subject, the case be referred to the next General Assembly."

It came up in the Assembly of 1862, and, on report from the Judicial Committee, was put upon the docket. It does not seem to have been discussed in that Assembly, but on the last day of its sessions but one, "on motion of Dr. R. J. Breckinridge was referred to the next Assembly."

In the Assembly of 1863 it was reported by Dr. Humphrey, Chairman of the Judicial Committee, as in order and ready for trial. When the time for its consideration arrived, Dr. Humphrey, one of the complainants, opened the discussion in their behalf. His speech is represented as one of great ability and power. The correspondent of the *Philadelphia Presbyterian* says of it: "The speech of the Rev. Dr. Humphrey, who appeared for the complainants, was a model for clear, succinct statement, and forcible argument, rising, at times, into a fervor which was exceedingly impressive, and secured for the speaker the undivided attention of the house."

His argument on the case was substantially as follows:

"I. The judgment of the Synod is erroneous, because, (1.) it rests on a wrong interpretation of Form of Government, chap. xv., sec. 4—where two classes of electors are described, those, namely, who are professors

of religion in good standing, and those also who, though not communicants, are stated contributors and regular members of the congregation.

(2.) It adopts an unsound theory of the church. Beginning with the proposition that the church should elect its own pastors, it terminates in the conclusion that those only who profess religion should be allowed to vote in the election. But baptized persons, though not communicants, are, according to the definition of our Confession, members of the church. (*Conf. ch. 25, sec. 2.*) The Synod virtually excludes these either from its idea of the church, or from their rights under that idea. (3.) Inconsistent with the position assigned by our standards to the baptized. According to Book of Discipline, chap. i, sec. 6: 'All baptized persons are members of the church, are under its care and subject to its government and discipline.' *Comp. Directory for Worship, chap. ix., sec. 1.* Why should those who are 'subject to the government and discipline' of the church, be prohibited from voting in the election of their rulers?

II. The judgment of the Synod is an innovation on the established usages of the Presbyterian Church. It can not be denied that the prevailing rule among us, from the beginning, has allowed contributing as well as communicating members of our congregations to vote for pastor. Among the Methodists the bishop, among the Episcopalians the vestry, among the Congregationalists the church and the society or parish, sitting in separate houses, appoint the pastor; but with us the members of the church and stated contributors most generally form the electoral body.

III. Many of the most valued and liberal supporters of the gospel are deprived of their just rights by the Synod. (1.) A parent is allowed to choose teachers for the secular education of his children; should he have no right of choice as to their religious teachers? (2.) May not a man, although not a professor of religion, have at least a single vote in the choice of one who is to have free access, as a pastor, to his family, and to be on terms of sacred intimacy with his wife and children? (3.) His personal salvation may be at stake on the choice of a pastor whose preaching shall edify him and whose wisdom shall ruin his soul. Why should he not be consulted? (4.) Here we find the distinction between the ruling elder and the minister of the word. The ruling elder is to be elected by the communicants alone, because his office of rule extends only to them; but the minister should be elected by the regular and contributing members of the congregation, because his office, as a teacher, extends to all who statedly hear the word of God from his lips. His relation as a *teacher* is the same precisely to those who profess, and to those who do not profess, to be Christians. Hence, at the ordination of the ruling elder, one of the questions is: 'Do you, the members of this church, acknowledge and receive this brother as ruling elder?' etc. But

at the ordination of the pastor the question is: 'Do you, the people of this congregation,' etc. *From Gov., chap. xiii., sec. 4, chap. xv., sec. 13.*

IV. Many of the people of God are deprived of their rights by this decision. The poor communicants may be allowed to vote on the ground that their just proportion of the expenses of the congregation is nothing. But under the rigid ruling of the Synod what rights have our wives and adult children, being professors of religion and not contributors? The suggestion that they are contributors through their husbands and fathers, is a mere legal or rather ecclesiastical fiction.

V. The judgment complained of is contrary to the real spirit of the Christian dispensation. This spirit made itself manifest, historically, in the fact that Peter was called to preach the gospel to the Gentiles, by the Holy Ghost, speaking through Cornelius, an unbaptized Roman; and in the call addressed to Paul, in a vision by the man from Macedonia. Even the missionary to the heathen, this day, is moved to undertake his mission, first by the work of the Holy Spirit on his heart, and the last command of Christ, and then, also, by the cry for the bread of life which comes up out of the bosom of the pagan world. These circumstances are not to be pressed so far as to be styled, in the technical sense, 'calls to the office of a christian pastor'—they simply exhibit one of the peculiarities of the dispensation which was overlooked by the Synod.

VI. The evils ascribed to the liberty of suffrage contended for by the complainants, are unreal. (1). In case an attempt is made by the 'outsiders,' as they are called, to force on the communicants an unwelcome pastor, the presbytery will surely interpose. (2). The usage has been general for more than a century, and it has not filled our congregations with unfaithful or incompetent pastors. It has worked well; with fewer evils and more advantages than could be experienced under the exclusive and rigid rule adopted by the Synod."

In the afternoon of the same day this case came up again in order, when Dr. Humphrey stated that there was another complainant upon the floor, and asked to know if the privilege of response would be granted the complainants after the close of the defense. The Moderator replied that without some special action of the Assembly he would feel obliged to proceed in accordance with the usual custom, which denied it. On motion, however, the privilege of response was accorded the complainants by vote of the Assembly. The discussion then proceeded as follows:

"Rev. Mr. Bayless, of Kentucky, from the complainants, wished to say a word in reference to the alleged danger of allowing outside parties

to take part in elections in the Church. So far as his experience had gone the results had always been good, and the effect had been to bring many into the church who otherwise would have remained outside.

Rev. Richard Valentine, of Louisville, stated that he had not come as a representative of the Synod of Kentucky, and had not expected to be called upon to defend the action of that Synod; but he had voted with them, and believed their decision to be correct. In reply to the protestants, he contended, 1st. That the Synod did not base their decision upon a new theory of the Church. They did not deny the membership of baptized children who were non-communicants, but they claimed that until they professed faith in Christ, they were not entitled to the right of suffrage in the election of a pastor. 2d. That the installation of a pastor is a spiritual act. The persons who make the call promise 'obedience in the Lord' and submission 'in the due exercise of discipline,' which non-professors can not do. 3d. The call of a congregation is the external evidence of the call of Christ through the Spirit to the ministry, and upon this the ministry proceed to ordain. Now, can Christ's call to the ministry be made through ungodly men? Are they his agents by whose instrumentality he makes known whom he has called to be his ambassadors? The call of the heathen is for a teacher, not for a pastor, for the missionary can not sustain that relation to them until they have become a church. 4th. In Apostolic times, elders and deacons were called by the church. The reason is stronger in the case of a pastor than in that of an elder or deacon, because the office is more spiritual. 5th. Non-communicants do, in effect, 'refuse to submit to the discipline of the church, properly administered,' by refusing to take the vows of God upon them, and thereby evading the discipline of the Church. No members are therefore excluded, who are truly worthy of the privilege. The speaker feared the Assembly would judge of the merits of the decision of the Synod by the feebleness of their advocates, and that they would be led into a wrong decision by the thrilling arguments which had preceded his. The complainants have the advantage. They come with able advocates and supported by strong names; and with the advantage of the opening and closing arguments, will leave such an effect upon the minds of the Assembly as will lead them to an incorrect decision.

Rev. H. V. D. Nevius was then called. He did not know that he ought to speak, as he was not present when this action was taken by the Synod, nor could he fully indorse that action. The speaker was proceeding to explain his position when he was called to order, upon the ground that the proper order at this time was the defense of the Synod; and upon the ruling of the Moderator, Mr. Nevius relinquished the floor.

Rev. Mr. Reed, from the Presbytery of Transylvania, thought the outsiders had no right to come inside and direct the affairs of the Church. They were hewers of wood and drawers of water. They were outside supporters, right and proper in their place, but had no right to enter into the affairs of the church. So far from cutting off the privileges of parents in the election of religious teachers for their children, their real good was secured by confining the right of suffrage to professors. While out of Christ they were not qualified to select religious teachers for their children, and they should be thankful there are those who are qualified by grace to do this work for them. As to the call of the heathen, they were passive recipients of the Gospel. The Spirit of God calls and the Church ordains. Peter went to Cornelius because the Holy Ghost sent him, and such was the reason he assigned when called to account by the Apostles.

Rev. Mr. Scudder thought the paper which formed the reply to the protest was a sufficient vindication of the action of the Synod, and therefore he would say but few words. What he had to offer he would suggest under four heads without amplification. 1st. As the Church is the body of Christ, voting for its officers belongs only to professors. 2d. The Scriptures do not authorize the world thus to interfere with questions affecting the interests of the church. 3d. The clause promising 'submission in the Lord' implies that those who call a pastor are professors. 4th. The practical workings of giving this right to outsiders, is most injurious. He knew cases where excellent pastors, loved by their communicants, had been extruded through the action of outsiders. He believed the experiences of the churches in Kentucky had proved these difficulties not simply imaginary.

Rev. Mr. Perkins, of Paducah, believed that the practice of the Churches in Kentucky, Tennessee, and Alabama, had been, according to the decision of the Synod. In those localities members who were not communicants had never taken part in the church. He heartily supported the action of his Synod. He loved the world, but did not believe in shaking hands with it and taking it into the house of God, of which they formed an humble part.

Mr. Hubbard, of Paducah, also addressed the Assembly, sustaining the action of the Synod. He could not recognize the validity of the arguments which had been brought against it. The only construction he could place upon the rules, denied the right to any but members of the church, submitting to its discipline, to take part in the elections in the church."

The case came up again on the next day of the sessions, when the Moderator announced the order to be the further



hearing of the defense. Rev. J. P. McMillan, of the Presbytery of Louisville, was called, and spoke as follows :

"He fully agreed with his colleagues in defense of the Synod, and had but little to urge beyond what they had said. There was one point, however, upon which they had not dwelt as strongly as he wished, and that was the exclusion of those who did not contribute their proportion to the support of the Church. The decision of the Synod was that those members who voluntarily subscribed to the support of the former pastor, and then persistently refused to meet their voluntary engagements, had no right to vote in the dismissal or election of a new pastor. They were covenant-breakers, repudiating a just debt; and no Church had a right to call a new pastor while in debt to the old one. He hoped the Assembly would be careful not to uphold any such immorality. The speaker illustrated his position by supposing that the Moderator had in his pocket one thousand dollars—which, said he to the Moderator, would not be a violent presumption, if you were not a minister (laughter)—and should deed it away to prevent payment of a debt, it would be a gross immorality. So in regard to the non-payment of pastors' salaries. No Church should be allowed to escape from the penalty of non-payment of salary to a former pastor, by being allowed to call a new pastor. It would be encouraging covenant-breaking."

As all the members present from the Synod of Kentucky, who desired to speak in defense of their action, had now spoken, and the response of the complainants being in order, the Moderator stated that no new arguments could be allowed to be introduced, and that they must confine themselves to answering arguments adduced by the defense. Dr. Humphrey, in behalf of the complainants, said they would treat the Assembly much better than that, and waive the right of response.

The roll was called that the members generally might express their opinions on the case. The material portions of the debate, which we find reported, are as follows :

"Rev. A. T. Rankin called for the reading of the decision of the Synod of Kentucky, and remarked that this was an exposition of the words of the Book. But it was not a correct exposition of the Book. It speaks of the 'people,' and not members or communicants. He referred to the election of elders, where the language contemplates members, but in the installation services of a pastor, the word congregation is used. In a call, the subscribers are those who contribute, according to the words used in



the call. These are the electors. It is a new doctrine sought to be imposed by the Synod of Kentucky upon their people. The rule of the Book is simply designed to exclude refractory or dishonest persons. He was proceeding, when he was called to order by the Moderator, who stated that the arguments on both sides were closed, and that nothing but brief expressions of opinion were now admissible. Mr. Rankin therefore resigned the floor, simply remarking that 'he was decidedly against the Synod and for the complainants.' "

The Rev. Dr. Lillie spoke as follows :

" Mr. MODERATOR:—I regard this case as one of exceeding interest and importance. It might even be questioned whether any other case of equal importance is likely to come before the Assembly. But for this very reason, utterly unused as I am to speak in such a presence as this, I have feared, I confess, to trust myself in any off-hand remarks. I have rather sought here to indicate my way of looking at the matter in a few written sentences, which it will probably conduce to brevity as well as distinctness, if you will allow me simply to read. I find myself then unable to agree altogether with either of the parties to this suit. Both of them, I fear, have got upon extreme ground, to which it will not be well for the Assembly to follow them.

1st. On the one hand, the right of voting for pastor is claimed for all who submit themselves to church censures, and for all who contribute to church expenses. The latter class, indeed, may include any number of unbaptized worldlings. But they, too, on the strength of their fifty cents or five dollars a year, are entitled, it seems, to coöperate on equal terms with the church of God, in choosing those who shall rule and teach in the household of faith. In defense of this sort of largest liberty, we have been referred to the case of the devout and large-hearted Centurion, who, fearing God with all his house, sent, in obedience to an express Divine command, for an Apostle to deliver his evangelical message. We have been referred to the case of another Apostle passing over into Macedonia with the same message, under an equally direct call of God in a night vision. We have also had pressed upon us what certainly struck me as a somewhat vague, transcendental theory of the changed relations of the church and the world in these latter days—a change, in virtue of which, if I correctly understood what was said, not only is the church now sent into all the world, bearing Christ's truth and grace to the perishing, but the world is brought into the church, as an auxiliary, if not a coördinate power. Of all this, sir, I have nothing to say but this—and I say it with sentiments of sincerest regard and affection for the venerable appellants—that the illustrations appear to me to be as irrelevant as the theory itself is, I am persuaded, novel, and subversive

of all sound principles of church order. Not for a moment can I believe that our Presbyterian fathers intended in that book to teach their children any such theory of the church, or of the government of the church. So much for what I have ventured to characterize as one extreme view of this matter.

2d. But now, on the other hand, the Synod of Kentucky, as I judge, has rushed into just the opposite extreme, though one by no means so perilous as that to which the appellants would push us. The Synod appeals with confidence to the Book, and as the decision of the Assembly must, I presume, rest entirely on the interpretation of the Book, let us again look carefully at the section in dispute—chap. xv, sec. 4: 'In this election no person shall be entitled to vote who refuses to submit to the censures of the church regularly administered, or who does not contribute his just proportion, according to his own engagements, or the rules of that congregation, to all its necessary expenses.' This being the law of the case, the Synod, I conceive, is perfectly in the right, as against the appellants, in at once and peremptorily excluding from the number of constitutional voters all unbaptized persons. The Church of God can know such only as strangers and foreigners. But when the Synod next proceeds to restrict the right of suffrage still further, to what we call professors of religion, or communicants, I must again seriously demur.

In the first place, if so simple an idea was all that was meant, it is not conceivable that the Book should have expressed it in such a singularly, awkward, and roundabout way.

But, secondly, it does seem but obvious, on the face of the book itself, that it contemplates, not a single class of voters, but two classes. And the distinction between the two is, not that the one class consists of baptized professors, and the other of contributors of all sorts, baptized or unbaptized, but rather this, that while both classes are silently assumed, as a thing of course, to have been alike baptized, the one class is found walking as loyal and obedient children of the church, and the other class shows its regard for gospel institutions merely by helping pecuniarily to sustain them. It was not to be anticipated by the framers of the Book, that any belonging to the first class would refuse to support the ordinances, or would prove to be delinquent in the fulfillment of their pledges, or that if they were found to be thus sacrilegiously dishonest, the Church would withhold her censures. However common these alternatives, one and all, may be in actual experience, they were not, I say, to be formally assumed in the establishment of our constitutional law. Accordingly, sir, it will be perceived that the phraseology of the section runs, not thus: 'No person shall be entitled to vote who refuses to submit to the censures of the church regularly administered, and who does not con-

tribute his just proportion according to his own engagements;' but thus: 'No person shall be entitled to vote who refuses to submit to the censures of the church regularly administered, or who does not contribute his just proportion,' etc. Clearly indicating, as I said before, that the latter clause was added for the very purpose of including certain parties not embraced in the clause preceding, and these other parties I understand to be baptized, non-professors, contributing faithfully of their substance for the maintenance of the house of God, in whose outer courts, at least they too desire to still abide. I can not doubt, therefore, that in forbidding this class to exercise the right of suffrage, the Synod erred, and that to that extent, but no farther, the complaint should be sustained.

Allow me, however, to take one other step, and inquire whether even the first of the two negative clauses of the Book necessarily excludes the baptized non-professor. 'No person shall be entitled to vote who refuses to submit to the censures of the church regularly administered.' But with what justice can a man be said to refuse to submit to church censures, to which he is never once called upon to submit? And is there a church or presbytery represented on this floor that has ever even attempted to deal with the baptized non-communicants as really members of Christ's church, engrafted into Christ, partakers of the benefits of the covenant of grace, and under engagement to be the Lord's. Alas, sir, are we not here again brought face to face with what must ever be regarded as the grand standing opprobrium of our ecclesiastical polity? Holding fast, as we do, to the blessed doctrine of God's covenant with the families of the faithful, we do yet allow ourselves habitually to ignore the intimate church relations of the baptized, and to speak of them, and preach to them, and pray for them, as if the thrice holy name had never even been named upon them! Oh, let us not, then, think to shift off from ourselves the responsibility of our own neglect, or cowardly unfaithfulness, by charging the baptized children of the church, who at any rate show their measure of grace and love by their outward support of ordinances, with refusing to submit to censures, which we ourselves, for whatever reason, have never offered to inflict. In a word, sir, I can not vote *simpliciter* for either sustaining or not sustaining the appeal. I would sustain it in part, in so far, that is, as the Synod's decision goes to disfranchise any of the baptized who do *not* refuse to submit to the censures of the church regularly administered, and do contribute their just proportion, according to their own engagement, or the rules of that congregation, to all its necessary expenses.

Dr. Wines said: The question before the Assembly is a question of constitutional law. It is to be decided, not by feeling, or expediency, or even usage, but by interpretation. The part of the constitution bearing upon the question is found in the 4th, 6th, and 7th sections of the

15th chapter of Form of Government. There is, however, it must be confessed, an ambiguity in the language of the 4th section. The provision to which I refer, reads thus: 'In this election (*i. e.* of a pastor), no person shall be entitled to vote who refuses to submit to the censures of the church, regularly administered, or who does not contribute his just proportion, according to his own engagements, or the rules of that congregation, to all its necessary expenses.' The object of this provision is to define the persons entitled to vote in the election of a pastor. But the phraseology is not perfectly clear; it is not quite certain whether one class of persons is designated, or two. It is impossible, therefore, to decide the question by this provision alone; since, if the language employed means but one class, the persons composing it must, of necessity, be communicants; but if it means two classes, one of them may be composed, in part at least, of con-communicants. Now, which of these interpretations is the true one? The provision itself is obscure and indecisive. But there is a well-established principle of legal interpretation, which lifts the obscurity and conducts to a solid conclusion. It is this: If any part of a law will admit of two constructions, one of which is consistent and the other inconsistent with the other parts of it, the former must prevail over the latter, in any fair interpretation of the whole law. The application of this principle to the present question is, in my opinion, decisive of the true meaning of the Book. The 6th section contains the form of a call to the pastorate of a congregation. This form embodies, among other things, a promise of support, encouragement, and obedience in the Lord. From the words, 'in the Lord,' in the connection in which they stand, it has been argued on the part of the Synod, with some plausibility, that all who vote for the pastor must be 'in the Lord' as Christians; that is to say, they must, at least, *profess* to be regenerated and living members of Christ. This, I admit, is the natural and obvious construction, and if there were no other provision of the constitution bearing upon the point, it might perhaps be regarded as imperative. But there is another provision bearing on the point, and one which has, as I think, a controlling effect upon its interpretation. The 7th section declares who may be authorized and required to sign the call to the pastor elect. It says that this may be done by the elders and deacons, by a select committee, or by the trustees, according as the congregation may elect. But from the origin of the Presbyterian Church in the United States, non-communicants have served, with the sanction of all our ecclesiastical courts, from the session to the General Assembly, as trustees in our congregations. Now, on the interpretation which confines the right of voting for a pastor to communicants, what sort of constitution have we? What is the language which it holds? It says that non-professing trustees may not *participate* in the

choice of a pastor, but they may be required to sign the call to him, when that choice has been effected by the suffrages of others. It says that they may not *vote* for their minister; but they may be *made* to give a pledge to support, encourage and obey him in the Lord. It says that they must stand outside the door, while the election is in progress; but the moment it is accomplished, they may be called in and *compelled* to give bond for the salary. This would be, in my judgment, little short of mockery. It is, to say the least of it, so glaringly inconsistent and self-contradictory that it is not to be admitted for a moment, if any other interpretation is possible. But another interpretation is possible, for, as we have seen, the 4th section may as readily and fairly indicate two classes of voters as one, and the words 'support, encouragement, and obedience *in the Lord,*' in the 6th section, need not be interpreted with the precision which would be required in the statement of a thesis in divinity, but may not be understood as meaning simply Christian support, encouragement and obedience, or as giving to the covenant a deeper solemnity than it would otherwise have, and imparting to it something like the sacred sanction of an oath. The language of the 7th section, which authorizes the signature of the call to a minister by non-communicating trustees, therefore, must in all fairness, as I conceive, be held to control the interpretation of both the 4th and the 6th sections.

On these grounds and reasons, and in accordance with what I believe to be a fair and just interpretation of the Constitution of the Church, I feel bound to give my vote, in this case, to sustain the appeal, and thereby to reverse the judgment of the Synod of Kentucky.

The Clerk proceeding with the roll—Dr. Blackwood stated that all the Presbyterian Churches in Scotland, England, and Ireland confined the right of suffrage in 'calls' to communicants. They allowed supporters to present a separate paper, but the Presbytery always acted on the call of the communicants. If the Synod of Kentucky was not sustained, the question must come up again soon before the Church. The question was whether the Holy Ghost qualified ungodly men for deciding whom Christ called to the ministry. The Church could not long allow that matter to stand undecided.

G. Junkin, Jr., made a short but very able argument. His positions were, 1st. The words church and congregation mean the same when applied to a particular church in our Form of Government. 2d. None except willing subjects of Jesus, our king, have the right of suffrage. 3. No others can promise 'obedience in the Lord.'

Dr. Nevin maintained, 1st. That those whom 'the God of this world had blinded,' were not qualified to call spiritual officers. 2d. Baptized children who did not come to the Lord's table, disfranchised themselves.

Rev. J. Thomas defended the complainants: 1st. A bishop must have a good report from those that are without. 2d. In the ordination of elders the words are, 'do you of this *church*,' but in that of ministers it is, 'do you of this *congregation*.' 3d. All churches in the world allowed the people some voice in the choice of pastors.

A. Sterling said that in his, which was the oldest church in Baltimore, they had allowed non-professors to vote, and he thought this practice general in the church.

Dr. Brownson contended that all attendants in a congregation were like those in the Jewish nation in the broad sense 'the visible church.'

Dr. Young sustained the complaint. 1st. The course of the Scotch churches in admitting a second paper was in *effect* allowing outsiders to vote. 2d. The phrase, 'the worldly maintenance which you have promised' applies to that class also.

Dr. Brownson concurred with Dr. Young. 1st. Ruling Elders were called to a spiritual office by private members, but the call of ministers was a call to persons already invested with office to serve a particular church. 2. The official relation of the minister is different, as he preaches the word, is received into families, etc.

Rev. G. Carpenter called the attention of the Assembly to the marginal reading of the Book used previous to 1821, viz.: 'none vote but regular members and those who sustain the pastor.'

Rev. S. Wilson sustained in part. 1st. Baptized persons whose moral character is not good are ecclesiastically dead. 2d. Those whose moral character is good should have the right to vote. 3. Females should not vote because they are to obey their husbands.

Rev. J. Carson sustained the Synod. He referred to the third class. Dr. Wines said there were two classes of voters. The complainants said there were three. The third class, if allowed, did really buy their votes. It was like the Romish doctrine of the sale of indulgences, and ought not to be allowed in any church.

Elder J. Strine said that the session of his church had become convinced that it was not expedient to allow non-professors to vote.

Judge Clark sustained the complaint for the following reasons: 1st. Usages in their favor. 2d. The language and history of the Book also. When Erskine seceded from the Church of Scotland even he admitted that non-professing heritors might vote. 3d. Any difficulties may be arrested by Presbytery. 4th. The decision of the Synod of Kentucky, if sustained, would bring the Church in conflict with the State, in some cases where certain charters are held.

Rev. J. Wiseman replied to Judge Clark in reference to Erskine. He left the Church of Scotland on account of the toleration of Unitarianism. The matter of suffrage had nothing to do with his secession.



Mr. W. said that allowing non-professors to vote was like allowing rebel soldiers to vote for officers of the Government.

Judge Leavitt sustained the complaint. His reasons had already been anticipated. The interpretation of the Synod was contradicted by the history of the church, and if the interpretation of the Book was doubtful the course of the church had decided it.

Rev. E. S. Wilson showed from the Digest that previous to 1820 the persons allowed to vote were styled 'regular members.' He also showed from Form of Government, chap. viii, that the session was called a 'congregational assembly,' and the church 'the congregation of believers.'

Mr. Malone continued the argument of the preceding speaker by referring to chapter ix, section 6.

Rev. J. C. Hanna contended that any government in church or State was in the hands of its citizens. Thought female members should vote—also minor professing children.

Rev. G. W. Ash sustained the Synod, but thought it not advisable to enforce it where the practice of the church was different.

Revs. J. Worrell, G. S. Inglis, R. Frame, H. B. Thayer, J. Fleming, F. A. Pratt, and Mr. Crosby continued the discussion, commenting upon arguments previously used.

Rev. G. Ainslie presented the following difficulty in defense of the position of the Synod. A and B are both regular contributors. Both are guilty of the same misdemeanor, not affecting their moral character as citizens, but unworthy of a church member. A is a church member, and coming under the censure of the session, loses his right of suffrage, but B not being a communicant retains his right.

Rev. W. E. Westervelt thought baptized members should have some privileges, as distinguished from the world, and one of those privileges was the right of suffrage.

Rev. W. Wilson said that all the arguments in favor of the complainants were from expediency and from pecuniary considerations. In Kansas non-professors do not ask the privilege of voting. No one would unless he was trained to claim such rights, for the common sense of men would teach them that they had no right of suffrage. In his State the Legislature, at the suggestion of Presbyterians there, had made it necessary that even Trustees must be church members. This was the only safe course.

Rev. A. Munson, during a ministry of twenty-five years, had never known any other practice than that recommended by the Synod."

The vote was now taken, and resulted: in favor of sustain-



ing the complaint, *seventy-four*; for sustaining in part, *forty-five*; for not sustaining, *thirty-seven*.

On motion of Dr. Nevin, a committee was appointed "to express the sense of the Assembly upon the case, with a view to harmonizing the sentiment." The Moderator appointed Drs. Lillie, Wines, and Nevin, and Elders Leavitt and Junkin. At the evening session, on the last day of the meeting, Dr. Lillie stated that the committee had been unable to agree, and would present three reports. Dr. Wines then read the following:

"The undersigned, who voted with the larger part of the Assembly, in the case of Dr. Breckinridge and others, complainants *vs.* the Synod of Kentucky, in its action limiting the right of voting in the election of a pastor to communicating members of the church, recommend the adoption of the following as the judgment of the Assembly in the said case:

*Resolved*, That the complaint be sustained; but the Assembly in this judgment does not intend to condemn a practice prevalent in some of our congregations in which the right of voting for pastor is confined to communicants.

(Signed,)

E. C. WINES,  
H. H. LEAVITT.

Dr. Nevin, in behalf of himself and Mr. Junkin, offered the following

"The undersigned, members of the committee appointed to prepare a minute expressive of the sense of the Assembly, on the complaint of R. J. Breckinridge and others, against the Synod of Kentucky, respectfully recommend the adoption of the following:

The Assembly sustains the complaint in so far as the action of the Synod declares that our Form of Church Government restricts the right of voting for a pastor to full communicants, to the exclusion of other baptized members of the church. But the latitude of suffrage which the complainants plead for seems to the Assembly too vague and tending too much to obliterate the scriptural and constitutional distinction between professing and baptized members and persons who have no other connection with the church than the contribution of funds to support her ordinances.

The Assembly is of opinion that while no one is *entitled* to vote except professing Christians and baptized persons, not under censure,

and who contribute their just proportion to the necessary expenses of the congregation, yet that it is competent for congregations to *permit* mere contributors to the expenses of the congregations to vote in cases where this course by reason of peculiar circumstances may be deemed best for the prosperity of the church.

(Signed,)

ALFRED NEVIN,  
GEO. JUNKIN, JR.

Dr. Lillie presented the following:

The undersigned member of the committee appointed to prepare a minute expressive of the sense of the Assembly, on the complaint of Dr. R. J. Breckinridge and others against the Synod of Kentucky, respectfully recommends the adoption of the following:

The Assembly sustains the complaint in so far as the action of the Synod restricts the right of voting for a pastor to full communicants, to the exclusion of baptized members of the church. But the latitude of suffrage which the complainants plead for, the Assembly does not sustain, because it tends to obliterate the scriptural and constitutional distinction between baptized members and persons who have no other connection with the church than the contribution of funds to support her ordinances.

Signed,)

JOHN LILLIE.

These three reports having been read, a motion was then made that the roll should be called and each member allowed to vote for such report as he might see fit, which was adopted, and the Clerk proceeded to call the roll with the following result:

For Dr. Wines' report,	- - - - -	72
For Dr. Nevin's report,	- - - - -	55
For Dr. Lillie's report,	- - - - -	17

The Permanent Clerk announced a difference in the count. The Stated Clerk had made it 71—58—17 in the order and place of the vote given above. It appears from this vote that the sum of those who voted against the report of Dr. Wines is just equal to those who voted for it. Had the Synod of Kentucky been allowed to vote, the complaint would not have been sustained. We may, therefore, assume that a majority of the Assembly were in part or wholly with the Synod.

Rev. E. S. Wilson then moved that the Assembly proceed to another vote upon the two reports having the highest number of votes at the first ballot, dropping the third. Mr. Clark moved to lay this motion, with the reports of Drs. Nevin and Lillie, on the table, which was adopted. Mr. Clark then moved the adoption of Dr. Wines' report. The ayes and noes were called for on this motion, which, being taken, resulted in the adoption of the report of Dr. Wines by a vote of ayes eighty-three, noes fifty-six.

Dr. Lillie, for himself and others, read a protest, which was admitted to record, against the action of the Assembly, in the adoption of Dr. Wines' paper. This protest does not appear in any report we have seen, or we would insert it; and the same with regard to an answer, if any was made; for we have aimed to give everything relating to this important case which presented any opinion, argument, or principle, that its entire history, and all the proceedings of the Assembly upon it, might be spread before the reader. At the risk of being tedious, we present a few thoughts which the case suggests.

1. That the decision of the Synod of Kentucky was erroneous, and the complaint just, we have no manner of doubt. We speak only of the simple issue upon the right of suffrage; for we have not, at any time, seen the papers of the Synod, or the complaint, in form. We know nothing of the language or arguments of either. But the point in dispute is clear. Nor is our judgment recently formed. We have never, since we have been in the ministry, entertained any other view of the law which governs the case, nor of what seems to be equitably demanded in regard to all whose interests are affected by the pastoral relation, nor of the scriptural principles on which the law is supposed to rest. Nor have we often met those of a different opinion. And as to the practice of the Church, our observation and experience have coincided. Every congregation with which we have been acquainted, where a case of instituting the pastoral relation has come up, has acted on the principle contended for by the complainants, and the judicatories above have ratified their action. We believe there is a general conformity among the churches to a practice contrary to the decision of the Synod. Until a comparatively recent period, this practice was well-nigh or quite universal from the origin of our Church in this country, according to many who have had large opportunities for observation. A different practice has more recently arisen, founded upon, as we believe, an erroneous theory of the Church. It was, therefore, quite time that this new theory should be tested before the higher courts. As further proof that the principles controlling the practice were well-settled, and generally concurred in, this is the first instance, so far as we are able to discover, in which the question, in a

judicial form, has been fully discussed and decided by the General Assembly.

2. Whatever may have been the practice of the Church, however, the real question at issue is one of interpretation or construction of our Form of Government. We take this to be the question between the Synod and the complainants, though, as before stated, we have not seen any of the papers. Both parties, we understand, admit that our constitution sets forth upon the point the true scriptural doctrine. The question is not, then, in fact, "What is the scriptural theory of the church upon the right of suffrage in forming the pastoral relation?" But it is, rather, "What theory does the constitution recognize, and what, therefore, is the true meaning of its language?"

The law might have been expressed in more explicit terms, but we think its meaning sufficiently clear both to guide and guard the people in the exercise of their rights. The language of the section of the law, brought chiefly into question, is in these words: "In this election, no person shall be entitled to vote who refuses to submit to the censures of the church, regularly administered; or who does not contribute his just proportion, according to his own engagements, or the rules of that congregation, to all its necessary expenses." We have always understood this to describe two classes of electors: (1.) Church members who are in good standing, or who are submissive to discipline. (2.) Those of the congregation who are not church members, but who are regular contributors to its expenses under the conditions stated. As a question of simple interpretation, we note three things:

*First.* It is a well-settled rule, applicable to all like cases, that the established practice which prevails under any form of law, beginning with those who, in good faith, framed the law, and continued by their successors for generations following, without being seriously questioned, determines the intent of the law. By this rule, the meaning of constitutions and laws in civil affairs is settled. By it, titles to property are regulated; and especially where undisputed possession has been maintained for a prescribed time, and no fraud appears. By the practice of the Apostolic church, we determine the meaning of some important portions of written revelation,

and much concerning other things relating to the order and perpetual law of the church. Tried by this rule, founded in the clearest principles of reason, the prevailing practice of the church in all parts of the country, from the beginning till now, must settle the meaning of the law upon the extent of suffrage in the choice of a pastor.

*Second.* As to church members, their entire qualifications as electors are fully embraced in the first member of the sentence of that part of the law in question, and involve, simply, good-standing, or, if under censure, submission to discipline when duly administered. This comprehends everything. It was not necessary to add to these specifications the qualification of contributing to congregational expenses, mentioned in the second member of the sentence. This latter duty is covered by the language which specifies the former. No member of the Church can, in fact, be in good standing, unless he contributes his "just proportion" to its expenses. We regard "giving" as a prime duty, a grace, an act of worship, as much so in its time and place as prayer or praise; and no member can fail in this duty without being censurable. This is according to the true theory of the Church, and the practice of apostolic times. It is the theory of our standards, and of the fathers who framed them; and if our parochial courts came up to the full discharge of their duty, they would administer "the censures of the Church" as readily for withholding these dues from the Lord's treasury, as for violating any other rule appertaining to his kingdom. Our Form of Government puts "making collections for the poor, and other pious uses," among the "ordinances established by Christ;" and the Directory for Worship prescribes "a collection for the poor, or other purposes of the Church," as one of the several acts of worship in the house of God on the Sabbath. These "collections" include, of course, in the meaning of our standards, all that may be paid for the pastor's salary, or for any other "necessary expenses" of the congregation, whatever may be the mode, in any congregation, in which these funds may be raised. No church member can omit this duty of contributing, and be in good standing. It was not necessary, therefore, to specify this particular duty, regarding this class of electors, any more than to point out any other duty.

The language which is used applying to them, covers the whole ground. The duty of contributing being thus necessarily involved in the qualifications specified, concerning church members, only the first branch of the sentence applies to them.

And here we can not forbear adding a passing remark, that the views of thousands of the Lord's good people are wrong in supposing, when they "contribute" their "just proportion," or any other sum, toward paying their pastor, that they are giving to the *man*, and bestowing a "charity." It may be so, in fact, in the intention of the donors. But the true idea is, that these are "gifts to the Lord," just as the gifts for the service under the old dispensation were. It is indeed the same, whether building a house of worship, "paying off the preacher," or contributing to any of the operations of the church, educational or evangelical, at home or abroad. These gifts should all be regarded as paid into the Lord's treasury, and as a service done *directly to Him*, which he commands, and, when properly done, which he accepts. If any member be too poor to contribute, the rule would not apply to him, or rather his "just proportion" would be nothing; but we do not believe the case ever existed where a member could not contribute something, both to sustain the Gospel where he worships and to spread it abroad, even if it were not more than "two mites," or one. The church needs a practical reform on this whole subject, and the place to begin is with the ministry, the elders and the courts, and then the people will understand and discharge their duties.

*Third.* Heads of families, and others in the congregation, though not members of the church, may vote for pastor, on contributing as stated. The latter member of the sentence in question is intended to apply to such. The qualifications of voters, in all elections, ecclesiastical and civil, must be determined by some test. In the case in hand, the only palpable test which could well be applied to those not members of the church is the one here laid down. The congregation may fix each one's "just proportion," or leave that to the contributor. As a question of interpretation, solely—the only light in which we are examining it—we think the law plain in its terms and intent; and these, judged by prevailing practice from the first,



settle the rights of parties upon the question of suffrage, beyond reasonable doubt.

3. The decisions of the General Assembly are always to be respected. It can not make law, but it is generally conceded that it is within its province, as a court, to interpret the constitution already made, for itself and for the whole church. We are not aware that all its decisions, even within its proper sphere—and especially those of mere interpretation of law—are binding in such a sense that it would be necessarily and always an offense in a lower court, or in a congregation, or a minister, to disregard them. We find no law for such an opinion. If such disregard is censurable, it is so only by inference. In judicial trials of actual cases its decisions are final. But in cases of mere construction of law it may be different. The Assembly is a new body, each year. What one Assembly may pronounce, as an opinion, about the meaning of the constitution, another Assembly may change. This has been done. No Assembly is infallible. "All synods and councils may err, and many have erred." And yet, while conceding all this, it must be maintained, that, except for the gravest reasons, the decisions of the supreme judicatory, made upon full hearing and careful deliberation, should be cheerfully submitted to and sacredly observed. In the case under consideration, the Assembly has given a judgment upon a matter of vital interest to the whole church. To this judgment we trust a ready acquiescence will be given. The gravity of the case, however, warrants a scrutiny into the subject-matter of this judgment.

4. What did the Assembly really decide? Its final action presents a very singular aspect of things. We confess to a disappointment. The minute adopted, embodying its judgment, is plainly the result of a compromise, and that, too, upon a radical principle of church government affecting the most sacred interest of every congregation under its care. Look at the votes, taken on three several occasions, and under three special aspects by the case; and examine, also, the three reports made by the committee, presenting conflicting principles—a committee appointed, according to the mover, "with a view to harmonizing the sentiment," and, according to the Moderator on announcing the committee, "to reconcile the



vote upon the complaint." But, above all, look at the report which was finally adopted, and which sets forth the Assembly's decision. This "judgment" really *decides nothing* as to the naked merits of the case pending between the parties at its bar; or, rather, we may say, that while it pronounces, in form, for the complainants, it does in fact practically set the decision aside, for it leaves the exercise of the right of suffrage in each congregation just where it was before. It purports judicially to decide a case between parties, and to settle the law on the only issue made; and then it allows, in express terms, the party condemned, and all others who may choose, to act directly contrary to the "judgment" announced! If this had been done by any other body than our highest court, we should deem it little less than serious trifling. Look again at the minute. It is determined "that the complaint be *sustained*;" and this by a vote of eighty-three to fifty-six. This, if it were all, would be of value. It would be a determination of the law, and a guide to congregations in their future action. It would settle the meaning of our Form of Government on a great principle of church order, at least in the view of that Assembly; and while it would "sustain the complaint," it would be equivalent to a solemn reversal of the decision of the Synod. If this be claimed as the effect of the "judgment," we reply that it looks very awkward and unsatisfactory, to say the least, to find that by the same vote, and in the self-same resolution, it is said, "but the Assembly, in this judgment, does not intend to condemn a practice prevalent in some of our congregations, in which the right of voting for pastor is confined to communicants."

Taking, then, the whole, and it is very evident that this decision *settles nothing upon the point of law*. It is really no interpretation whatever of the law, upon the issue joined, worthy of a court, when rendering a *judicial decision*. Legally, it leaves matters where they were before. Practically, it leaves each congregation to construe the law for itself, and to act accordingly; and thus opens a wide door to a contrariety of practice under the same statute, and under influences, on one side or the other, which are often not commendable, and upon a question of forming one of the most important of all relations known to the church. We doubt whether the minute

adopted will prove satisfactory to either party in the case, or to the church at large. It would have been better, if the Assembly *had* an opinion, had it decided, one way or the other, squarely upon the simple issue made; and either by its "judgment" restricted the right of suffrage, in all the churches, to those in full communion, or declared the right open, by the Form of Government, to all for whom the complainants contended, and enjoined the churches to comply. All our churches would then have been on the same basis touching the pastoral relation, and if any were aggrieved the matter could have been brought before some future Assembly.

While we do not approve the minute adopted, we regard the other two reports equally or more objectionable. They both deny the right of suffrage to any but "full communicants and other baptized members of the church," while the complainants contended for the right in behalf of other contributing members of the "congregation," and which the Assembly "sustained," so far as it decided their case at all. But we should have much preferred the adoption of such a resolution as that reported by Dr. Jacobus, upon this same case, from the judicial committee of the General Assembly of 1861, viz.: "That, whereas the Form of Government does not exclude those from voting for a pastor who are members of the congregation, but not members of the church, provided they have complied with the requirement in Form of Government, chap. xv, sec. 4; therefore, the protest and complaint be sustained, and the decision of the Synod be reversed." This covers the whole ground, meets the issue squarely, and is clear and decisive. In express terms, it gives an explicit interpretation to the constitution, upon the meaning of which the case arose; sustains the view of the law taken by the complainants, reverses in fact and form the decision of the Synod; settles for the guidance of the whole church a radical principle of church order; and leaves compromises to matters for which they were intended. We sincerely wish such a minute had been adopted.

#### CORRESPONDENCE WITH OTHER BODIES.

Many years ago, the General Assembly was in fellowship with numerous religious bodies, at home and abroad, partly through annual epistolary correspondence, and partly by an

interchange of delegates. This extended to most or all the Congregational Churches of New England, the Dutch Reformed Church and others in this country, and to the Scotch and Irish Presbyterian Churches and others across the Atlantic. Several years since, from causes deemed sufficient, this correspondence was suspended with one after another of these bodies, the movement beginning in some cases (perhaps in all) with the Assembly, until the Reformed Dutch Church and the Associate Reformed Synod of the South were the only ones left. Within two or three years past, a disposition has been manifested to open correspondence with several churches with whom we have had no such intercourse, and to renew with some others that which had been suspended.

At the Assembly of 1861, the Committee on Foreign Correspondence reported that Rev. John D. Gibson was present as a delegate from the Associate Reformed Synod of New York. He represented the Synod as desirous of Christian correspondence with the Assembly. He was welcomed, and addressed the Assembly, and Dr. Sprole was appointed delegate to the Associate Reformed Synod of New York. Dr. McMullen, of Tennessee, was also appointed, at this meeting, delegate to the General Assembly of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church. This was the commencement of correspondence with these churches. The correspondence with the Reformed Dutch Church and with the Associate Reformed Synod of the South was continued by the appointment of delegates.

At the Assembly of 1862, all these churches were represented but the last named, whose failure was occasioned, we presume, by the war. At this Assembly, Rev. Robert Watts, of Philadelphia, was appointed to represent the body in the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland. Also, a correspondence was opened with the General Assembly of the New School Presbyterian Church, by letter, which resulted in the mutual appointment of delegates, who appeared at each Assembly respectively held in May last. A correspondence was also opened, by letter, in 1862, with the General Assembly of the United Presbyterian Church, and delegates from each Assembly attended their respective meetings held the present year.

In each of these several instances—one of renewed and three

of entirely new correspondence—except the one first named, the initiatory steps were taken by our own Assembly. We hail these results as a good omen, tending to draw into a more intimate fellowship those bodies which hold the essentials of our common faith, and whose principles of church order and forms of worship are so nearly alike.

#### UNION OF THE OLD AND NEW SCHOOL CHURCHES.

Memorials for the union of these two branches of the Presbyterian Church were presented from the Presbytery of Chippewa, and from Messrs. Warden and Day, of Colorado Territory. They were referred to a special committee, consisting of Dr. Condit, Mr. Spear, and Dr. Young, and Elders Clarke and Newkirk, who presented the following report, which was adopted :

“The committee to whom was referred the memorial from the Presbytery of Chippewa and Overture No. 1, respecting the union of the two branches of the Presbyterian Church, called the Old and New School, report that they have endeavored to consider the subject in that careful and serious manner which its importance demands, and would submit to the Assembly, for their consideration and adoption, the following resolutions, viz. :

*Resolved*, 1. That, in the judgment of this General Assembly, it is not deemed expedient to take, at this time, any decided action with reference to a re-union of the New and Old School Presbyterian Churches.

*Resolved*, 2. That, in the fraternal correspondence now happily inaugurated, the General Assembly would recognize an initiative in the securing a better understanding of the relations which subsist between the two Assemblies, and the means of promoting that mutual charity, and that just apprehension of the true grounds of Christian union and fellowship, which may serve to prepare the way for a union that shall be harmonious, and permanently promotive of the interests of truth and vital godliness.

*Resolved*, 3. That, as a still further preparative to such a desirable union, the General Assembly deem it important—and this in reference to both these branches of the Presbyterian Church—that the ministers and ruling elders, and such as have the care and instruction of the young, be increasingly careful to exhibit clearly the distinctive principles of Christian doctrine and sound polity as held by the Presbyterian Church ; that the ministers of these two branches of the church cultivate fraternal intercourse and interchange of views and feelings ; and in all suitable ways encourage and aid one another in the appropriate work of the ministry ;

and that the members of the one or the other branch connect themselves with existing congregations of either, rather than cast in their influence and their aid with bodies whose principles and form of government are foreign to their own."

This action we deem judicious. No papers calling for the union were presented but the two above mentioned, showing that there is no urgent call on the part of the church at large. The papers presented were from frontier settlements. We can appreciate the desire which brethren situated in sparsely settled regions must feel for the union into one church of the few scattered Presbyterians among them. But this can be effected without a step for which the church, as a whole, seems not prepared. If these brethren of the Old and New School churches could cordially unite, in their several congregations, after a union of the bodies at large through the General Assembly (even if it should be within the competency of the Assembly to enact such union), they can do it without such action. If the elements of enduring union do not exist in their convictions and feelings, they would not be prepared for it after any formal action by the General Assembly. Our brethren upon the frontiers, or any where else, who desire union, need not, therefore, wait for the Assembly to act. Within the State of Kentucky, until within a few years past, there were both New and Old School churches in all parts of the State. These are all now united under the same ecclesiastical rule, and they took all the steps essential thereto, of their own voluntary motion.

We are decidedly in favor of the union sought by these memorials, and in favor of a far more extended union than they call for. We would rejoice to see the union of all true Presbyterians, divided now under different names; but not until they can come together in good faith as one body—one in doctrine, order, and worship—so that the union may be one of compactness and strength, founded upon principles which will conduce to harmony, confidence, and effective co-operation in every good work. We trust that good day will yet come. Until it shall come, these various bodies can accomplish more for our common Christianity as they are at present situated. That it has not yet come, we infer from the fact, that no general call has been made upon the Assembly to take measures leading to

such union. That local unions would be greatly facilitated in some respects by such a general one as these memorials contemplate, we can readily understand; but the general good should not be sacrificed to local convenience.

#### PLACE FOR THE NEXT MEETING.

On the second day, the question of the next place of meeting came up. Boston, Washington City, Pittsburg, and Newark, N. J., were nominated. After an extended discussion, the vote resulted as follows: Boston, 136; Newark, 74; Washington, 15; Pittsburg, 6. Boston was thus chosen by a decided majority on the first ballot.

On the evening of the last day, just before the close of the sessions, the Assembly reconsidered the vote for meeting in Boston. This action was eminently wise. A feature of the brief discussion which ensued is worth noticing, if for no other reason than *that it is suggestive*. We give it as reported in a Peoria daily: "A motion to select Newark called forth Rev. Mr. Brown in favor of the claims of Washington. A member from Baltimore stated that the feeling in his Synod was decidedly against the holding of the Assembly in any of the Border States. Newark, N. J., was then selected by a rising vote as the place for holding the next Assembly."

The feature to which we refer is found in the remark of the unknown Baltimorean. We are at a loss to divine the reason of it. We deeply regret such a speech, and sincerely trust the speaker misrepresents the Synod for which he claims to speak. We should still more regret to know that he truly represents that "feeling;" that it is "decidedly" entertained; that any presbytery or synod in the church, which thinks it proper to be represented in the Assembly, or any man who would consent to be its representative, should be opposed to its meeting within its bounds; or that any Presbyterian can entertain the impression, for a moment, that such a question as the place of meeting should be at all affected by any local "feeling," or even local judgment, further than the body may choose to consult its own personal convenience or propriety; for the General Assembly—and so of the Synod and the Presbytery—has an inherent right to meet anywhere within its own bound which it may elect, without waiting for an invitation or ask-



ing permission; and sometimes it has occurred, that the very church or place where "feeling" would not have the judicatory meet, is the very place where it should meet.

But waiving all this, we protest that the Synod of Baltimore has no right to speak for the ministers and people of all the Border States. We do not claim to speak for the Synod of Kentucky, but we venture to say that the Assembly would be cordially welcomed within its bounds; and if any persons who in form or heart adhere to the Presbyterian Church are, from "feeling" or otherwise, "decidedly against the holding of the Assembly in any of the Border States," we trust they will be brought to a better mind toward the supreme judicatory of their church, or seek ecclesiastical relations more congenial to their "feelings."

Washington, however, does not happen to be "in any of the Border States." We would like to know why it is that the Assembly may not meet in the capital of the nation, on ground common to all parties in the State, and certainly common to the church. Is it because the Assembly has become of late rather too patriotic in its utterances to suit Presbyterians in that locality? We well know that there is a decided element of disloyalty in some of the churches of the Synod of Baltimore, including those within the District of Columbia; but we hope, for the credit of our ministerial brethren at least, that there has been no such concession to disloyalty as to result in an understanding among them, prompted by the "feeling" intimated "decidedly" to exist, to keep the General Assembly out of their bounds. We are "decidedly" of the opinion that a visit of the Assembly would do good at the capital, for we know of no place in the country (and we claim to know something of Washington society), where sympathy with the rebellion is more deeply seated, active and demonstrative in some of its peculiar forms, than in that city, under the very shadow of the government, in the church and out of it, among those who are making more money out of the trade which the war has brought to their doors than they ever before dreamed of, as well as among those who bask in the sunshine of power, and whose families have been fed and clothed by the Government, through the emoluments of office, all their lives. If the reason for the "feeling" expressed "against the



holding of the Assembly" in Washington, springs out of or is a concession to the iniquitous sympathy with treason and rebellion which so pervades the capital of the Nation, we think there are strong grounds for believing that a visit of the Assembly there would be "decidedly" salutary.

#### CHURCH COMMENTARY.

This subject was brought before the General Assembly by Dr. R. J. Breckinridge, several years since. He submitted a plan upon which it was proposed that a complete commentary on the Holy Scriptures should be prepared and published under the supervision of the Assembly, to be conformed to the doctrinal standards of the Presbyterian Church. The subject has been discussed in several assemblies, but no definite action has been taken further than to refer the matter to a committee, hear their report, continue the discussion, and postpone final action from year to year. An able report in favor of the project was made by Dr. E. T. Baird, on behalf of the committee, some two or three years since.

The subject came up in the last Assembly, and, on a motion for indefinite postponement, was again discussed by Drs. Blackwood, Delancy, Nevin, and Judge Clarke, against the motion and in favor of the commentary, and by Dr. Brownson and A. T. Rankin in favor of the motion; when, finally, the motion was lost, and the subject was referred to the next Assembly.

#### REVISED BOOK OF DISCIPLINE.

This is another subject which has been pending several years. Reports have been made upon it by able committees, or by a committee several times modified, and much discussion has ensued. It was taken up early in the late Assembly, and more progress was made than on any other similar occasion. The first seven chapters were considered during portions of several days, many amendments were made, and these chapters adopted. Among the final proceedings taken upon the subject, Mr. Goodale moved to refer the remaining portion of the Book, from the beginning of the eighth chapter, to the next Assembly. Judge Clarke stated that this was the unanimous desire of the committee. Dr. Humphrey offered an

amendment, requesting the next Assembly to make its consideration the first order for the second day of the session; and in this form the resolution passed.

It is not important, at the present stage of this business, to pass any judgment upon the labors of the Assembly. The amendments adopted are so numerous, many of them minute, some affecting great principles and others merely verbal, and withal, from the reports we have seen, some of the more important of the changes made by these amendments are presented with so much ambiguity, that we have by no means a clear view of what has been done. And then, furthermore, whatever the Assembly may have done, granting it all to be well done, no part of its work is decisive and final. After the next Assembly shall have gone entirely through with the revision of the remaining chapters, the whole must go down to the presbyteries. As the Book can not become law without adoption by the proper number, the Presbyteries may finally approve or condemn the whole.

And even now, although only the part beginning with the eighth chapter has been referred, the whole is open to discussion. We do not perceive, however, that the Assembly made any provision, as has been done two or three times before, to have the Book presented to the churches at large, in so far as it has now been adopted, that it might be open to general examination. Perhaps this is well. It may be best to have no further presentation of this sort, except what may be found in the official minutes when published, until the whole can be officially and formally sent down to the presbyteries, for their adoption or rejection.

#### SYSTEMATIC BENEVOLENCE.

Dr. Loyal Young, chairman of the committee on this subject, submitted the following resolutions, which were adopted:

*“Resolved, That the General Assembly re-enact the action of 1851, viz.: that the churches that have no fixed times for contributing to the Boards, be earnestly requested to take up annual collections as follows: For the Board of Domestic Missions on the first Sabbath of November; for the Board of Foreign Missions, on the first Sabbath of January; for the Board of Education, on the first Sabbath of March; for the Colportage*

Fund, on the first Sabbath of May; for the Board of Church Extension, on the first Sabbath of July; and for Disabled Ministers' Fund, on the first Sabbath of September.

*Resolved*, That, if it is inconvenient for any church to make the contributions on the days specified, they be requested to make them as soon thereafter as possible.

*Resolved*, That the secretaries of the several Boards be directed to transmit to the pastors and churches circulars a short time previous to the days named for making these contributions to each object, calling their attention to the subject.

*Resolved*, That no pastor does his full duty who fails to bring before his people annually all these objects of benevolence.

*Resolved*, That the ruling elders of the vacant churches be instructed to endeavor to secure annual collections for all these objects.

*Resolved*, That the Secretary of the Board of Publication be directed to send to the stated clerks of the Presbyteries, blank forms of reports on Systematic Benevolence, and that it be enjoined on the stated clerks to report annually to the General Assembly."

#### PROFESSORS ELECTED.

The report from the Committee on Theological Seminaries presented the fact that there were three vacancies in the chairs of two of these institutions, viz.: the chair of Didactic and Pastoral Theology, in the Western Theological Seminary at Allegheny City, Pa., occasioned by the resignation of Rev. William S. Plumer, D. D.; and the chair of Didactic and Polemic Theology, and that of Biblical Literature and Exegesis in the Theological Seminary of the Northwest, the former occasioned by the resignation, several years since, of Rev. N. L. Rice, D. D., and the latter by the decease, in December, 1861, of the Rev. William M. Scott, D. D. The committee recommended that the first and last mentioned chairs should be filled by elections at this Assembly.

When this business came up for consideration, Dr. Beatty moved the time for these elections, and nominated for the vacant chair in Allegheny Seminary, Rev. Lyman Atwater, D. D., at present the Professor of Moral Science in the College of New Jersey, at Princeton. This nomination was warmly sustained by brief remarks from Dr. Humphrey, and others, all bearing testimony to the personal worth of Dr. Atwater and to his eminent abilities, fitting him for the position

Judge Leavitt, of Cincinnati, nominated for the chair of Biblical Literature and Exegesis in the Seminary at Chicago, Rev. Charles Elliott, D. D., now Professor of the Greek Language and Literature in Miami University. This nomination was also sustained by the remarks of several members. Mr. Shields nominated for the chair in Allegheny Seminary, Rev. E. D. MacMaster, D. D., and accompanied his nomination with some highly complimentary remarks. Dr. Nevin nominated Rev. William Blackwood, D. D., of Philadelphia, for the Chicago Professorship, with a statement of his eminent qualifications for the position.

Before the time for the election came, Dr. Blackwood, who was a member of the Assembly, obtained permission to have his name withdrawn, and Rev. Charles Elliott, D. D., was then unanimously elected to the chair for which he had been nominated, receiving 158 votes, the whole number cast. Dr. Atwater, for the chair in Allegheny Seminary, received 156 votes; and Dr. MacMaster, for the same chair, 81 votes. Dr. Atwater was declared elected. Dr. MacMaster was not present at the Assembly.

#### REVISION OF THE HYMN BOOK.

An overture was presented from the Presbytery of Albany for a revision of the Hymn Book, now in use among our churches. This does not seem to have occasioned any lengthened discussion, but from the action taken we infer that the impression was general that some step looking to revision was demanded. The Committee on Bills and Overtures presented a report, from which we make the following extract:

"II. With reference to the overture from the Presbytery of Albany, which has been put into their hands, and to which the Board has yielded a qualified assent, subject to the decision of the Assembly, the committee recommend, that, inasmuch as uniformity in our Church Psalmsody is highly desirable, any effort at improvement should be made by the whole church, and not by any section or single presbytery. And, inasmuch as the *Tunes* associated with our common devotional lyrics differ so widely in different parts of the country, and musical education and tastes are so diversified, it seems impossible, at present, to compose a book of music, of moderate size, which shall satisfy the whole church; therefore, the Assembly do not sanction the proposition of the Presby-

tery of Albany, to publish a Book of Hymns and Tunes, as requested by the Presbytery of Albany.

III. But, since this overture furnishes one of many indications that there is a growing desire, in all parts of the church, that our Psalmody should be enriched from the large stores of lyric poetry which have accumulated since our Hymn Book was compiled, we recommend that the Assembly appoint a committee to take this whole subject into consideration, and to report to the next Assembly what changes, if any, should be made in our present Book of Psalms and Hymns. Also, to consider the expediency of arranging portions of the Word of God in a form suitable for chanting in our congregations."

It appears from this report, that the Presbytery of Albany desired to publish a Book of Hymns and Tunes, under the sanction of the Board of Publication, with the approval of the Assembly. This would have given a *quasi* sanction by the Assembly. The report was adopted, and the declinature of the proposition was just. There is, however, a wide-spread impression that our Hymn Book needs revision. It is far inferior to several with which we are acquainted, and it might be greatly improved. We are among those who believe in progress being made in our church music, both in the poetry and the tunes used in our public worship. The Assembly appointed an able committee to act under the foregoing minute, and we trust they will take time and produce a Book worthy of the purpose for which it is needed.

The following are the names of the persons composing this committee: J. T. Backus, D. D., S. Irenæus Prime, D. D., H. A. Boardman, D. D., William Blackwood, D. D., N. C. Burt, D. D., E. P. Humphrey, D. D., Willis Lord, D. D., Geo. Potts, D. D., Charles W. Shields, D. D., William M. Paxton, D. D., Cyrus Dickson, D. D., C. Kennicott, Boston; David Keith, St. Louis; Charles N. Todd, Indianapolis; Robert Carter, New York.

#### RELATIVE AUTHORITY OF ELDERS AND TRUSTEES.

The Presbytery of Cincinnati requested the General Assembly to "define the respective rights of the trustees and session in their control of the edifice used for public worship, and to direct what steps should be taken in cases of disagreement or collision between them."

The Committee on Bills and Overtures presented the following report, which was adopted. The views here presented are so just and discriminating that we present the report entire. Where conflict of authority arises on this subject in any congregation, here will be found the true solution :

" Where a church edifice is held by trustees, the legal title is vested in them, and having the title, the custody and care of the church follows to them for the uses and purposes for which they hold the trust.

These uses and purposes are the worship of God and the employment of such other means of spiritual improvement as may be consistent with the Scriptures and the order of the church, to which may be added congregational meetings for business relating to the church or corporation. By the constitution the session is charged with the supervision of the spiritual interests of the congregation, and this includes the right to direct and control the use of the building for the purpose of worship, as required or established by the special usage of the particular church or the Directory for Worship. This being the principal purpose of the trust, the trustees are bound to respect the wishes and action of the session as to the use and occupation of the house of worship. The session is the organ or agent through whom the trustees are informed how and when the church building is to be occupied, and the trustees have no right to refuse compliance with the action of the session in this regard. These are general principles applicable to all cases, except perhaps in some localities where special statutory enactments by authority may confer other rights and prescribe other principles.

But there are other purposes for which the use of the church edifice is sometimes desired, which, though they partake of a religious or an intellectual character, do not fall within the class of objects which are properly described as belonging to the worship of that congregation. The house may not be used for such purposes without the consent of the trustees. As the function to determine what is a proper use of the house is vested in the session, the trustees have no legal right to grant the use of the house for purposes which the session disapprove, and as the strict rights of those who are represented by the session to the use of the house, are limited to the worship of that congregation, the trustees are under no obligation to grant it for any other purpose. When the trustees grant the use of the house to others, contrary to the expressed wishes of the session, and as they suppose to the prejudice of the cause of religion and of that church, the proper appeal is first to the persons composing the congregation to whom the trustees are responsible—secondly, to the presbytery for their advice, and finally to the legal tribunals."

## BOARD OF CHURCH EXTENSION.

A brief abstract of the operations of this Board, as we learn from their published Annual Report, is as follows:

"The number of applications for aid put on file from April 1, 1862, to April 1, 1863, was seventy. These applications were from churches in the bounds of twenty-one synods, thirty-seven presbyteries, and fifteen States and Territories. These seventy churches ask for aid amounting in the aggregate to \$24,954.40, averaging \$356.49 each. Besides these new applications filed during the year, there were sixty-one previous applications calling for \$24,991.75 undisposed of April 1, 1862. The Board, therefore, had before it, during the twelve months under review, one hundred and thirty-one applications calling for nearly \$50,000. During the year, six applications asking for \$8,625 were declined chiefly for want of funds, and thirty-seven applications requesting aid to the amount of \$13,691.75 were stricken from the file, because they had not furnished the requisite information in the two years allowed for that purpose. There remained on file and undisposed of for want of the usual information, April 1, 1863, applications from thirty-two churches calling for \$12,750. During the year under review appropriations amounting to \$10,308.40 were made to forty-six churches in the bounds of seventeen Synods, thirty-one presbyteries, and sixteen States and Territories. The average amount appropriated to each of these forty-six churches was \$224.09. Appropriations amounting to \$625 were, during the year, withdrawn from five churches. To one of these, however, a new appropriation was soon after made. The names and localities of all these churches will be found in the appendix to this report."

Dr. John M. Lowrie, of Fort Wayne, Indiana, chairman of the committee, to whom the report of this Board was referred, presented a report, embodying several resolutions, which we can not insert entire, but of which the following is the substance: The Annual Report is approved, and also the minutes of the Board, and the report is recommended to be published. The third resolution commends the economy with which the Board have conducted their work, "in view of the difficulties of the times." The fourth calls attention to the gratifying fact that very many churches, in all parts of the country, have relieved themselves of debt. This is spoken of as "remarkably simultaneous," and as calling for "gratitude



to God for his special favor," and in answer to prayer. The second resolution is so important that we embody it in full :

2. "We call attention to the facts that more than two-thirds of our churches are still entirely delinquent in contributing to the funds of this Board ; that the small amounts given—less than ten churches reaching the sum of \$100—indicate that the merits of the cause are too little laid before our people ; and that the increased cost of building makes larger contributions more important than before. We recommend, therefore, that the presbyteries be directed to inquire at their fall meetings what churches have taken the collections enjoined by the Assembly for July, on behalf of the Board of Church Extension, and to urge a more general attention hereafter to the wants of this Board."

The report was sustained by remarks from Rev. Dr. Coe, Secretary of the Board, who was invited to address the Assembly ; and also by the Rev. Messrs. Hayes, of Baltimore, Brown, of Georgetown, D. C., Judge Clark, of Detroit, and others. Judge Clark thanked the Assembly for what they had done through the Board for the churches in Michigan. "There was a large infusion of Old School Presbyterian sentiment in his State, through the work in part of this Board ; and, although they discarded divisive action, they were in a better condition, by this agency, to advance and enlarge our bounds in that direction." After these addresses the report of the committee was adopted.

#### BOARD OF EDUCATION.

We find, in the Annual Report, the following interesting statement concerning the work of this Board for the year past, in aiding by its benevolent labors to increase the number of the ministry :

"The following table exhibits the operation of the Board of Education in the department of candidates for the ministry :

The number of new candidates, received during the year, has been	88
The number received from the beginning (in 1819),	3202
The whole number on the roll during the past year has been	318
Of these latter there have been,	
In their Theological course,	155
" Collegiate "	125
" Academical "	83
	318

The aggregate number of candidates during the year now closed is sixty-two below that of last year, but is almost up to the average aggregate of the past eleven years. For that period the average aggregate has been three hundred and ninety-eight, while for the year covered by the present report, the average has been three hundred and ninety and five-sixths. This is a result for which the Board feel that great gratitude is due to the Head of the Church."

Rev. Dr. Wines, of New York, presented the report upon this subject from the committee to whom had been referred the Annual Report of the Board. We present the first three resolutions of the committee's report entire:

*Resolved*, 1. That the General Assembly recognize as matter of fervent gratitude to God, the fact that in the midst of civil war, and of the agitations, calamities, and financial pressure consequent thereupon, the Board of Education should not only have been able to meet promptly all current expenses, as they accrued, but also to liquidate a debt of more than \$4,000, and to accumulate a balance altogether of \$9,283.41, of which amount nearly one-half is to the credit of the Ministerial Education Fund; and the Assembly hereby records its approval of the diligence, zeal, and wisdom with which the Board and the Executive Committee have discharged the duties of their position.

*Resolved*, 2. That the General Assembly has noticed with a concern proportioned to its deep and far-reaching significance, the alarming decrease in the number of candidates offering for the gospel ministry, and exhort that earnest prayer be made of the church continually that the Lord of the harvest will multiply and send forth laborers into the harvest.

*Resolved*, 3. That the General Assembly concur with the Board in urging upon all ecclesiastical bodies having academical institutions under their control, that they use the most strenuous endeavors to elevate the standard of academic culture, and to make such culture broad, thorough, and every way worthy, both of the past history and of the future exigencies of the Presbyterian Church."

Rev. Dr. Chester, Corresponding Secretary, addressed the Assembly at great length, reviewing the operations of the Board during the past year. He said, "the number of young men taken from their studies for the ministry, who had enlisted under the banner of their country, was larger than the members of the Assembly were aware." He referred to the "large number of ministers unemployed," and said, "if

their history were traced, it could be shown they were never under the influence of the Board." After Dr. Chester's address, the report of the committee was adopted.

We would say nothing to injure this Board, but everything to aid it, for we regard it as one of the most important agencies of the church. Nor would we say a word to the disparagement of so good a man as Dr. Chester. We do not see, however, how it is, that coming "under the influence of this Board"—which we take to mean, being a beneficiary thereof, as a candidate—secures a man from ever being found in the ranks of "ministers unemployed." We have never supposed it among the powers of the Board to insure against that misfortune. We have known instances to the contrary. Dr. Chester is over sanguine, or he has not been correctly reported.

The resolutions present matter for very thoughtful and prayerful consideration. The first exhibits a state of things apparently cheering, and the Assembly, led by the committee, deem the condition of the finances such as to call for "fervent gratitude to God." But it admits of a doubt, or rather it seems highly probable, that the facts prompting to "gratitude" concerning the funds of the Board, grow out of that other condition of things mentioned in the second resolution, which is justly regarded with "concern," and which should humble the church, as this latter state of facts is occasioned by the judgments of God which have prompted the course of many candidates, for a time at least, in leaving their studies for the army, as intimated by Dr. Chester. We have an overflowing treasury *because* of the "alarming decrease" in the number of candidates. This we regard rather as an occasion of sorrow than of gratitude. The recommendation of the third resolution we must heartily indorse.

#### BOARD OF DOMESTIC MISSIONS.

We have space only for the following account of the operations of this Board for the year:

"The whole number of missionaries in commission since March 1, 1862, is 409. The number of churches and missionary stations in whole or part supplied (so far as reported) by those holding commission, is 676. Twenty churches are reported as having been organized during the

missionary year. The number of admissions on examination is 1242, and on certificate 777; a total of 2019. The whole membership in churches connected with the Board, is 17,755. Sabbath schools number 279, with 2453 teachers, and 16,680 scholars. The number of baptisms reported is 2105. As almost one-fourth in commission have not reported, the returns are manifestly inadequate, and do not express the facts; and in this connection, the Board would suggest to the Assembly that this is an annual complaint; and the purpose in asking for these detailed reports is nullified, and the view is not what your body would seek for in requiring this yearly exhibit from the Board. Pains are taken to send, in ample season, blanks, which can be readily filled up, and which we respectfully ask the brethren to transmit in season to the office. What remedy may be required, we leave to the wisdom of the Assembly."

The discussion upon the affairs of this important subject was interesting, and we present some selections from it. Dr. Janeway, Corresponding Secretary, was invited to address the Assembly:

"Dr. Janeway gave a brief account of the operations of the Board. The amount contributed last year to the support of the Board was \$72,000. This had been insufficient for the successful carrying-on of the work, and the consequences were that the Board is losing ground. The arrivals of foreign emigrants at the city of New York alone during the last week averaged 1,000 per day. In view of this he deemed it necessary that some action should be taken to make the collections large enough to enable the Board to keep abreast with the large tide of immigration, and maintain their rank in this work with the other churches of the country."

The report from the Committee on the Annual Report of the Board, was read by the Chairman, Rev. Dr. McFarren. We give but two resolutions from it, as follows:

"*Resolved*, 2. That the Assembly feel themselves called upon to give thanks to God, for having put it into the hearts of his people to furnish the Board with the means of liquidating the debt incurred in former years, which amounted, at the commencement of the year which has now closed, to something like \$5,000, retaining in the treasury a balance with which to commence the operations of the current year.

"*Resolved*, 3. That it would have been still more satisfactory, if this result could have been achieved by increased contributions from the churches, instead of continuing the reduction of the scanty allowance to missionaries, and avoiding new fields. We regret to learn from this

Report, that, instead of increase, there was considerable falling off in the amount received from the churches, as compared with the year preceding. The Board acted wisely, we have no doubt, in making the liquidation of the debt an object of primary concern; but we can find no apology for the churches withholding, in a year of so much pecuniary prosperity, the means which were needed for the vigorous prosecution and extension of the work."

The discussion then proceeded as follows:

"Rev. R. A. Delancy called for the reading of the second section of the report, after which he stated that he felt a peculiar sympathy in this work. If God had gifted him with the silver-tongued eloquence of some of the brethren he would impress with all his power, upon the lay members of this Assembly, the importance of returning to their homes, and entering upon this work with their whole hearts, giving to Dr. Janeway a replenished treasury, so that he might go on as the work demanded. The Domestic Mission Board should be developed to the extent of the utmost resources and ability of the Church. It should be vitalized, supported and fostered with all the power of its right arm. Wherever you planted a home church, you established another contributor to the foreign fund. He referred to his last attendance upon his synod in the sunny South, on which occasion he had traveled four hundred miles down the valley of the Red River to Port Hudson, passing in the whole route within sight of but one church, and not one school-house. And this was through one of the most fertile regions of this country. This single church was on the banks of the river at Alexandria, the place lately occupied by General Banks. He had also recently preached in a log cabin, away in the wilds of the Southwest, with two pine slabs for an altar, and the wild winds sweeping through the chinks of the logs. He supposed that three-fourths of the churches of our denomination in the South are closed, in which the voice of prayer and melody is no more heard. He held a letter from a pastor in the South, who had received no salary for two years, and whose family suffered for the necessities of life; and this was the case with many who had now no means of support at all. The Synod of Texas covers more territory than the six New England States, and New York, Ohio, and Indiana. Twenty-nine missionaries only were in that synod. No one knows aught about the desolation of the South. The question is all summed up in this—there is not room for two Anglo-American Protestant nations between the Lakes and the Gulf. The question then is—Washington or Richmond. And when we have conquered those men of the South, their feebleness will throw them upon the church. And what will be the responsibilities of this mission when four millions of

the dusky sons of sorrow in the South will, by this action, have their claims upon it. He would like to offer a resolution that the Assembly say to the Secretary of the Board, we will double your income, and make it \$150,000.

The appeal of Mr. Delaney was earnest and deeply impressive, and secured the undivided attention of the Assembly.

Rev. Mr. Scott, of California, by request, presented a few facts in regard to affairs in California. He had been repeatedly asked if there were any vacancies in California. He had replied there were none. Ministers who went to that State would have to follow his example. He first went to Areada at Humboldt Bay. There he preached two Sundays, when an effort was made to raise funds for his support one year. \$1,200 were obtained. He concluded this was the place for him. Three months later, \$1,400 were subscribed to build a church, and the work commenced. Now they were out of debt, and the church in a flourishing condition. This is the fact in regard to that State. There are no vacancies, but there are plenty of Humboldt Bays. From the report of the Board, there are only six missionaries in this large State, only five of whom obtained aid from the Board. There were sixty-nine in Pennsylvania. He thought this should be reversed. There are thousands in California who had not heard a sermon for years. The people of California, as a mass, are intelligent, and a preacher who goes there must know something. Such a one will be kindly received, and well supported. The principal trouble in sending missionaries there is the cost of transit, but he had no doubt if many were sent the majority would be able to support themselves.

Rev. Mr. Spear—It is proper that each should give some reports of the destitutions of the field he occupies. The speaker represented the extreme Northwest—particularly Minnesota. The country has been settled with unusual rapidity, with a large population, who have sought a healthy country. It will always be a resort for that large class of immigrants. There is then a large proportion there of American born citizens of unusual intelligence. But Mr. Spear would direct special attention to the Scandinavian population of that country. Other churches have shown great interest in this land, and have met with much success. If we do not send the gospel to the Upper Mississippi, others will, and will gather the families of Presbyterians. It is, however, entirely a missionary field.

Rev. Mr. Osmond feared the impression would be left upon the minds of the Assembly that too much attention had been paid to the missionary work in the East. To correct such an impression, he briefly reviewed that work with the urgent necessities constantly calling for it.

Rev. Mr. Giltner, from Nebraska City, narrated the progress of the

work in the far West, and the difficulties the missionaries were there obliged to encounter. Where do your brothers and your children go when they leave their eastern homes in the spread of civilization toward the setting sun? Will you deprive these of the means of obtaining the Gospel of Christ? The Presbytery of Missouri River takes in all the territory of Nebraska. The workers there are all missionaries, but they are much discouraged in their work. They have prayed, but in vain, for more workers in that region. There are many important fields in their Presbytery which can not be occupied, for their applications for aid meet with the answer that there are not funds sufficient. One most important point is near the Omaha Reservation, where the influence of the mission upon the Indians would also have a great effect upon the white population. A large German population, too, was constantly flowing into that section. Large numbers of foreign Mormon emigrants, meeting with disappointments at Salt Lake, were constantly returning to the border within the limits of his Presbytery, and some of the most valued members of his church were from this same class.

Rev. Mr. Benedict, of Connecticut, wished to be indulged for a moment while he spoke for the East. They were destitute, even in Connecticut. In some places they had not ministers to bury their dead. He had been told in one section that they had not heard a sermon in six weeks. In regarding the South, the West and the North, they should not forget the claims of the East.

The Moderator called Dr. Beatty to the chair, stating that he wished to call attention to a matter which had not yet been alluded to. He thought the presbyteries should be more careful in recommending churches for aid. Many were now seeking assistance from the Board, who were perfectly able to support themselves. He himself had seen churches applying for aid who should be ashamed of it. This was wrong, as it deprived many, who absolutely needed it, of assistance."

After this discussion, the report of the committee was adopted.

#### BOARD OF FOREIGN MISSIONS.

The Annual Report on this subject was referred to a committee, of which Rev. Dr. Nevin, of Philadelphia, was chairman. The report presented by him was discussed at length, and adopted.

Our two Boards of Missions, domestic and foreign, exhibit, in their yearly work, so much of the practical labors of the church in spreading the gospel at home and abroad, that we



deem it proper to give more space to a consideration of their operations than to those of some of the other Boards. Hence, we present the material part of the discussion upon Foreign Missions before the Assembly, as we have done that on Domestic Missions. We make selections from what appear to be the best reports which have come into our hands.

Dr. John C. Lowrie, one of the Corresponding Secretaries of the Board, after the reading of the report, was invited to address the Assembly:

"Dr. Lowrie reviewed at considerable length the operations of the Board, and the difficulties under which they had labored. He urged particularly the necessity of enlarging all the missions. Those already established are now in a prosperous condition, but a large increase to the funds of the Board will be needed during the coming year.

Mr. Robert Carter then addressed the Assembly in regard to the financial condition of the Mission. He had always felt great interest in this work of Foreign Missions. More than a quarter of a century ago he had bid farewell to the present venerable Moderator, then a dark haired young man with his partner at his side, and had presented him a copy of the Bible. Now he stands before us, with the weight of years upon him, a representative of a far-off land. He could not trust his feelings in dwelling upon such matters but would pass to consider the unprecedented rise of exchange on foreign remittances, which had greatly increased the cost of supporting the Missions, and threatened great injury to the cause. No less than \$26,500 had been paid for exchange during the past year above what was formerly required, and \$24,000 more would be needed prior to the first of October. He urged upon the churches more particular attention to the missionary work.

Rev. J. H. Morrison, Moderator of the Assembly, followed. He entered into a detailed account of the condition of the missions in India, in which he had labored long. He stated that the Foreign Mission work had for the past few years been rapidly going backward. For ten missionaries who had permanently returned from the work, only four had gone out, and there is now but one effective agent at each station. The mission at Lahore had not received a single missionary since 1855. And it had already been voted to recommend the Board to relinquish this station, that the remainder might be strengthened. The retrograde movement has long been going on. The appeals of the missionaries have been in vain. The General Assembly was last year warned of this, and unless attention is paid to these appeals, and more missionaries are sent, other stations must be given up. The labors now imposed upon members

of the mission are far greater than they should be called to bear. But little encouragement is given them in their work, and they can not but feel that they are being forgotten at home. This is cruel and unjust. He referred to the diminished condition of missionary periodicals, and the little interest manifested in them. 20,000 copies of the *Foreign Missionary* were printed, and one copy circulated, it is said, in each family in the church. These are distributed in the churches, where large numbers of them are left until the sexton takes them for waste paper. The church sends missionaries abroad telling them to labor, and suffer what the Lord may call upon them to bear, but 'never let us hear from you.' The speaker made a most urgent appeal on behalf of the cause. This was the last time he should probably ever address this Assembly. He was about returning to the field in which he had labored for twenty-five years, to give the remainder of his energies to the noble work.

Mr. Conger then offered the following resolution :

*Resolved*, That relying for support in this our declaration upon the great Head of the Church, we humbly call upon our Board of Missions to go forward, and pledge ourselves to urge immediate action in this matter upon our respective presbyteries, and to renewed efforts in bringing our churches to a more efficient co-operation in this noble work.

Dr. Beatty felt a deep interest in this cause. When a youth he had offered himself as a foreign missionary, but the Board to which he applied, could not send him. Subsequently when in middle life the subject had again come before him, and he was willing to go but Providence hedged up his way. The next best thing he could do he did, and trained an adopted son for the work. That son in the gospel was now in the field and the oldest missionary of our Board. We need more of the missionary spirit.

Rev. Mr. Spear, a returned missionary, narrated at some length the trials and difficulties of a missionary's life. Few could realize the exhausting character of the work. Much time was necessarily lost in studying the languages, from ill health and other causes. The number of missionaries must be increased, and the fund largely augmented, to meet the expenses of apparatus and other appliances so necessary to the work.

The report of the committee was then adopted, after which Mr. McCoubry moved that the resolution of Mr. Conger should be adopted by a rising vote, and that the Moderator should call upon some member to lead in prayer, imploring the divine assistance in enabling those who should vote for it to maintain their pledge. The resolution having been read by the clerk and adopted by a standing vote, Rev. John Fleming, in behalf of the voters, offered a fervent supplication for divine aid in consecrating themselves anew to the service of their Master, and impressing upon their people the importance of the missionary work. He

earnestly sought the divine blessing upon those who were now laboring in heathen lands, that their hands might be strengthened in their labors and that new missionaries with their hearts deeply imbued with the greatness of their mission, should be sent forth to the harvest now ready for the reaper.

Dr. Goodale then offered the following, prefacing it with a few remarks. He thought it would yield an annual revenue of \$50,000 :

*Resolved*, That our pastors and superintendents be urged to endeavor to secure from all of our Sabbath schools a contribution equal to at least one cent per week for each scholar."

#### SUPPORT OF DISABLED MINISTERS.

This important subject appears to be receiving more and more the attention of the church from year to year. Rev. A. T. Rankin, from the committee, presented the report, from which we select the following resolutions, adopted by the Assembly, with portions of the discussion :

" *Resolved*, 3. That in view of the success and favorable acceptance of the plan recommended by the Assembly of 1849, and sanctioned by several subsequent Assemblies, this Assembly re-affirm said action, and recommend that annual collections be solicited in all the churches for current expenditures ; and also that large donations and bequests be solicited to form gradually a permanent fund, the interest of which shall be pledged in aid of the objects indicated.

*Resolved*, 4. That the report be appended to the Minutes of this Assembly, and be printed by the Board of Publication, a copy of which shall be sent to each pastor, with a request that it be read to his congregation.

*Resolved*, 5. That if the sums contributed by the Church in any year exceed the sum needed to meet the demand upon it, the Trustees be authorized to invest such surplus as a part of the Permanent Fund in such way as that it shall be safe and productive.

Judge Leavitt moved the adoption of the report and begged leave to make a few remarks. There was no necessity to speak in vindication of this fund. He asked to be heard on two grounds : 1. He had had a connection with this subject for some years. 2. Ministers may feel some delicacy in speaking on this subject, and therefore a few words from a ruling elder might be acceptable. He thought that the present method of raising funds had proved itself to be the best under the present circumstances. The policy of a permanent fund of a large amount he thought unwise and impracticable. The committee appointed by the last Assembly on this subject had not been called together, and he supposed

the policy was abandoned. Judge Leavitt also spoke of the generous gifts by which the officers of this fund were supported, and the gifts of a few individuals.

He was supported by T. McKennan, Esq., of Washington, Pennsylvania, who called on the members of this Assembly, and especially the lay members, to take the deepest interest in this work, and to give their best efforts to the support of so worthy a cause. Other churches had long since made arrangements for the support of their superannuated ministers, while it was only within a few years that the Presbyterian Church had made any movement in the matter. He had known cases where the widows of deceased pastors had been obliged to sell the libraries of their husbands for support. Ministers are too delicate and negligent in bringing this matter before their people. He hoped all members would appreciate the importance of the work.

Rev. Mr. Lee—The question is, Are there any who need the support of this fund? The report says there are. So every minister can testify. When the speaker was a boy, he knew an aged minister who had spent a useful and stainless life. He was reported to be in great distress, and he was sent as an almoner, and found him without a crust. But this benevolence was merely voluntary and limited, and this fund is to be permanent and general. The speaker referred to the current prejudice against old pastors, and the relief which is given to such aged servants is invaluable; they are Christ's poor.

Rev. L. E. Baker preferred annual collections to the plan of a permanent fund. He was opposed to anything that would relieve the churches from this collection.

Rev. G. S. Plumley thought the laymen and the younger ministers particularly should labor to advance this cause. He also was opposed to a permanent fund formed by collections, but a fund of this kind might be raised by bequests and donations.

Mr. Geo. Junkin, Jr., spoke of the difficulties the committee had to contend with. Interferences were constantly being made, under the plea of substituting something better. The plan of the committee is good and should be sustained. The ministers should be sustained both while able to labor and when they have become disabled. He hoped the whole of the report would be received, with the amendment that ministers be required to read it in every church. It would do great good. Ministers often felt a delicacy in bringing this matter before their people, but if the Assembly made an *injunction*, they would be relieved of this embarrassment. Mr. Junkin's brief but eloquent remarks were listened to with profound attention.

Dr. J. M. Lowrie opposed a *requirement* upon the ministers making it necessary to read any report. He strongly opposed the plan of adducing

extreme cases as a specimen of the general treatment of ministers of our churches.

Dr. Nevin hoped it would be passed. He further said that if this fund is not supported, there would be great secularization of the ministry. He admitted that isolated and extreme cases should not be adduced as proofs of a general rule. He hoped that the ruling elders would persist in their support of this noble cause."

#### BOARD OF PUBLICATION.

We give the following abstract of some of the operations of this Board, taken from their Annual Report as presented to the General Assembly:

"The Board has issued during the year,

	COPIES.
5 new books, of which have been printed - - -	10,000
3 new tracts, - - - - -	24,000
1 package of 21 soldiers' tracts, - - - - -	3,000
1 hospital card, - - - - -	20,000
2 packages of leaflets, - - - - -	6,000
2 German books, - - - - -	700

Total copies of new publications, 63,700

The reprints of former publications during the year have been,

Of books, - - - - -	226,000
Of tracts, - - - - -	253,000
Of packages of tracts, - - - - -	17,000—496,000

Total number of publications during the year, 559,700

Total number of copies of books and tracts issued by the

Board since its organization, 10,790,488

In addition to the above there have been printed during the year,

Of Sabbath School Visitor, - - -	676,000
Of the Home and Foreign Record, - - -	126,000
Of the Annual Report of the Board, - - -	4,000

And by order of the General Assembly:

Of the Revised Book of Discipline, - - -	3,000
Of the Report of the Disabled Ministers' Fund, - - -	2,000
Of the Report on Systematic Benevolence, - - -	3,000

Bringing together the various items of distribution, which have above been given separately, the aggregate will be as follows:

Volumes sold at the Depository, - - - - - 175,019

	COPIES.
Volumes sold by Colporteurs, - - - -	43,947
Volumes given by Colporteurs, - - - -	72,299
Volumes granted by Executive Committee, - -	26,950

Total of volumes distributed,	318,215
Increase over last year, - - - -	78,281

The pages of tracts distributed are as follows :

By sale at the Depository, - - - -	570,461
Gratuitously by Colporteurs, - - - -	2,399,030
Granted by Executive Committee, - - - -	683,968
Total, - - - -	3,653,459
Less than last year, - - - -	731,679

In addition to these, the Board has issued,

Copies of the Sunday School Visitor, - - -	676,000
" " Home and Foreign Record, - - -	126,000
" of various Reports, - - -	12,000

Besides Sessional Minutes and Registers, Forms for Systematic Benevolence, Sabbath-school class-books, Sabbath-school tickets, Sheet hymns, Hospital cards, etc., etc., in great numbers.

The net value of these issues of the year is as follows :

Sales in the Depository, - - - -	\$25,889.15
Sent to Seminaries, Authors, Editors, etc., - - -	338.87
Sales by Colporteurs, - - - -	20,493.02
Home and Foreign Record, - - - -	3,864.19
Sabbath School Visitor, - - - -	5,502.51

Total of net value,	\$56,087.74
---------------------	-------------

#### INVESTIGATION OF THE AFFAIRS OF THE BOARD OF PUBLICATION.

For several years past, in successive General Assemblies, complaints have been made against some of the Boards. The Board of Education, we believe, was the first whose operations were severely criticised before the General Assembly. This was many years ago. The amiable and pure character of its chief secretary, the lamented Dr. Cortlandt Van Rensselaer, was deemed by many a sufficient guaranty that its affairs were managed prudently. A radical difference of opinion existed regarding the principles adopted by the Board, by which schools of all grades were taken under the super-

vision of the Church. But the complaints against this Board have long since died away, either from a general acquiescence in its management, or from being drowned in the louder clamor which has since been raised against certain other Boards. We believe these complaints never culminated in the appointment of a committee by the General Assembly to investigate the affairs of the Board of Education.

The Boards of Domestic Missions and of Publication have not come off so easily. In several successive Assemblies strong and denunciatory speeches were made against both of them, while they ran the gauntlet in parallel lines. This was especially the case, as many who were present remember, at the Assembly of 1859, at Indianapolis. The action of these Boards was defended ably by their respective secretaries, Dr. Musgrave appearing for the Board of Domestic Missions, and Dr. Schenck for that of Publication. A committee was finally appointed to investigate and report upon the affairs of the former Board. The result has been, that some changes have been made, Drs. Musgrave and Happersett resigned their secretaryships, Dr. Thomas L. Janeway is now the Secretary, and under his efficient management the Board has been doing its work for two or three years, entirely to the satisfaction of the Church, so far as we know, and "the churches have had rest" from this disturbing element in the General Assembly.

The trials of the Board of Publication lingered longer. It was annually made the subject of criticism in each Assembly up to that of 1862, when an able committee was appointed "to make a thorough investigation of the affairs of the Board of Publication, and report to the next General Assembly." This committee consisted of Rev. Drs. Beatty, McPheeters, Atwater, J. M. Lowrie and Paxton, and Elders Leavitt, Donaldson, Crosby and Whitely. This committee was directed to meet in Philadelphia, and make a personal and "thorough examination of the affairs of the Board;" the Board was directed to give them all needed facilities "in carrying out the objects of their appointment;" and "all persons from any part of the church" were to "have full opportunity," and were "requested, either in person or by writing, to present to the committee any objections or doubts they may entertain in regard to the plans and operations of the Board;" and the



Board were "directed to pay the traveling and other expenses of the members of this committee from its treasury."

The committee met as directed, made their investigation, and presented to the late Assembly the result of their work in an elaborate report, the material portions of which, from the importance of the matters brought out, and the interest the church at large takes in the subject, we deem it best to lay before the reader.

"Dr. Beatty, from the committee, read from the Minutes of the last Assembly the manner of appointment of this committee. He said the work they had accomplished to the best of their ability, and he now called upon Dr. Lowrie, secretary of the committee, to read their report.

The main points in the report are as follows:

1. Complaints from various quarters, chiefly from individuals, were received by the committee.

2. Facilities were given by the Board, and all its officers, for the investigation.

3. The first matter of investigation was into the character of the publications of the Board.

The various *criteria* by which to judge of these publications are: 1. Orthodoxy. 2. Adaptation to the wants of the Church. 3. The actual sales secured by these publications. 4. Attractiveness in style and appearance. In all these respects, the publications of the Board are thought to be worthy of approval.

4. *Financial Operations and the Capital of the Board.* The capital is \$237,000. This can be used actively only for about \$160,000. The average annual profit for thirteen years is six and four-fifths per cent. The salaries of officers may be retrenched. Under this head the following recommendations were made: 1. That the salary of the Corresponding Secretary be unchanged; but that he be made the Editor of the Board. 2. That the office of the Treasurer and Superintendent be combined. 3. That the duties of the Publishing Agent be assigned to the Superintendent of Depository, without any increase of salary. 4. That the office and salary of Solicitor be discontinued. 5. That a bookkeeper be continued as at present with the same salary.

The question arises, should the Board do all its work of printing and publishing? After examination and consideration, the committee do not think it wise or necessary at the present time. No censure is made by the committee on this part of the subject.

5. *The General Efficiency of the Management of the Board.* The Committee made an examination into the work of the last thirteen years, and submitted the following table:

Years.	Total Capital.	Estimated Capital, exclusive of Real Estate, Plates, etc.	Sales.	Salaries.	Expenses.	Profits.	Profits per cent.			Per cent. Expenses on Sales.
							On Capital.	Active Capital.	On Sales.	
1840	\$24,054	\$30,000	\$30,434	\$6,329	\$2,050	\$2,900	3.5	5.	7.6	23.2
1850	100,686	63,600	52,644	6,595	2,515	22,650	8.5	14.8	15.9	15.5
1851	119,003	60,000	50,437	7,959	2,570	12,086	10.1	17.5	20.3	17.8
1852	137,684	75,000	70,968	7,350	2,314	14,172	10.3	18.6	20.	13.4
1853	151,221	80,000	77,642	10,193	2,849	17,980	11.9	21.	23.1	17.
1854	169,302	100,000	65,793	11,188	3,234	7,253	4.2	7.25	11.	21.8
1855	176,433	103,000	63,341	11,342	2,949	11,186	6.3	10.8	17.1	21.8
1856	167,641	104,000	81,055	12,723	3,706	11,937	6.3	11.	14.7	20.96
1857	199,578	112,000	73,811	13,671	3,937	12,221	6.1	10.9	16.5	23.
1858	211,709	118,000	69,027	14,075	3,706	5,463	2.6	4.6	7.9	25.7
1859	217,272	120,000	80,933	14,180	3,539	12,161	5.5	10.	15.	21.8
1860	229,453	130,000	81,849	15,307	4,792	13,154	5.7	10.	16.	24.6
1861	242,567	140,000	31,631	13,660	3,036	-5,300	-2.			34.6
1862	237,387	135,000								

\* Donated for building purposes.

Having before said that the average of profits on the entire capital was 6.8 per cent., we now add that the average per cent. of profits on the active capital as estimated, is 11.9; the average per cent. cost of salaries on average sales is 16.4; the average per cent. of total expenses on average sales is 21.3; and the average per cent. of profits above expenses on average sales is 17.5.

The committee here considered the operations of the Board as business operations and benevolent operations. The Board was not intended to be simply a business concern. But the benevolent operations must not be hindrances to the extension of the trade of the Board. In regard to the general operations, the work of the Board may compare favorably with any other institution of the same kind. Bad debts only amount to seventy dollars per annum.

Another question is, can not the sphere of the Board be enlarged, and its operations made even more efficient? Depositories, the committee concluded, were not the means to enlarge the efficient operations of the Board. The control of the business should not be given to one person, and a proposition made to the Board was wisely declined.

*Recommendations.*—1. Books for Sabbath school libraries should be multiplied. 2. A more liberal discount should be given to one good bookseller in every large city. 3. That the Board should sell entire editions of works to other publishers, with their imprint.

6. *Colportage.*—This is an important branch of the Board's work. The committee was urged to consider this as merely a business matter. Some think that all denominational efforts of this kind should cease. The committee dissent from both these opinions. They think too much money has been spent in salaries of District Superintendents. It is true

that the Assembly has indorsed this; but the committee think the sum might be diminished.

7. *Periodicals of the Board.*—Little need be said about the *Home and Foreign Record*, as all the Boards are concerned in this. The *Sabbath School Visitor* is worthy of support. Its cost should be reduced.

On motion of Dr. Nevin, a vote of thanks was tendered the committee for the diligence and fidelity with which they had performed their duties."

The foregoing report of the Investigating Committee was referred to the Committee on the Annual Report of the Board of Publication. On behalf of this committee, Rev. Dr. Hickok presented a report embracing eleven resolutions, a synopsis of which we here give, with the discussion which followed.

"While the committee disapprove of the proposal of the Presbytery of Albany in regard to a hymn book they offer the following: 1. Discontinue the office of Editor and assign his duties to the Corresponding Secretary. 2. Continue salary of the latter except his life insurance. 3. Transfer duties of Treasurer to Superintendent of Colportages. 4. Transfer duties of Publishing Agent to Superintendent of Depository. 5. Discontinue office of Solicitor and continue that of Bookkeeper. 6. Put the Periodical Department under one man with a salary of \$1,300, and that he employ his own clerks, etc. 7. Require a full report every year from the Board, Executive Committee, etc. 8. Discontinue the addition of six per cent. to the capital and enjoin upon the Board to conform as far as possible to the recommendations of the special committee on the subject of profits, etc. 9. Assign the subject of the preparation of a hymn book to a committee to report to the next Assembly. 10. Discontinue payments for contribution to the Visitor. 11. Publish the report of the Special Committee in the report of the Board and Appendix to the Minutes.

Dr. Schenck, Secretary of the Board, then addressed the Assembly in reference to the present condition of the Board and its operations during the past year. His remarks were chiefly confined to three points. 1. There had been a considerable diminution this year in the receipts. 2. There had been fewer books purchased this year. 3. The increased cost of materials. The Board had latterly published fewer new books and more issues of old books. Many colporteurs had accepted other employment, but a large number had volunteered in this service. He referred to the vast army and navy in the field. He thought half a million of our brave soldiers and sailors had been supplied more or less

with our books. Not one officer or chaplain had ever been refused books. He referred to the great influence of the Soldier's Pocket Book. He complimented the report of the Special Committee and would cheerfully submit to any action of the Assembly but would desire permission to express doubts in regard to the propriety of dispensing with the services of Dr. Engles, the Editor of the Board.

The discussion was continued by Dr. Lowrie, who had the floor at the close of the morning session. After claiming for himself the most friendly relations with Dr. Engles, he presented in a kind and conciliating manner several urgent reasons for a discontinuance of his office. His remarks were listened to with marked attention, and evidently had great weight with the Assembly.

The proposition to unite the offices was opposed strongly on the grounds of its impracticability and the strong claims of the present editor from his long service in the church. The principal arguments in its favor were its feasibility and the necessity upon the score of economy.

Dr. Sheddan thought Dr. Engles ought not to be ousted. It was a penny-wise and pound-foolish policy.

Mr. Delancy moved to amend by adding 'when his office becomes vacant.' Lost.

Dr. Blackwood opposed erasing Dr. Engles' name with great earnestness.

Dr. A. Nevin said that the matter was one of great delicacy, and any more against the Board must be made under proscription. The committee acted fairly. I did not go to the committee myself. Things have been done in my absence from the Board, on the plea of delicacy. I have tried to reform these things. Dr. Schenck is the Editor of the Board but technically. Dr. Engles is not the Editor. The salaries of the officers of the Board are too large. I hope that delicacy will not interfere with justice.

Mr. G. Junkin, Jr., would not follow in the spirit of the last speech. It did not deserve reply. The spirit of the speech was easily discernible. He was in favor of striking out the whole resolution, and made this motion.

Dr. Beatty, as Chairman of the Committee, explained the reason of this resolution. The reduction of the expenses of the Board has been a subject of discussion for years. Dr. Engles has received this salary for many years. He did not think that the labor was too much to be added to the Secretary of the Board. But the Assembly must judge for themselves. Of late the duties have not been very large or onerous.

Mr. Mott thought the Assembly was approaching a subject which might be of great danger. Gray hairs are not respected as they should be, and have been. Dr. Engles has served this church even down to

old age, and my soul revolts against this stigma of age. There is a principle at stake. This is a false move and a false economy. We propose to save twelve hundred dollars. The Board is beginning to move again in publishing. The duties are heavy and growing. There is an economy that defeats itself, and will end, I fear, in a carelessness in our publications for want of time. There is nothing deserving more wisdom, care, and prudence than this matter of supervising the publications of our church.

Mr. Mecklin opposed the last speaker, and thought that sympathy for the Editor should not be allowed its influence here.

Rev. Dr. Lowrie, of Indiana, followed. This was the action of the committee in deliberate and united council. The salary of the Editor has varied in different years. The work of rejection is not so large as might be thought. It is not necessary to read a whole book in order to know that it is not fit for publication. Dr. Engles has not confined his labors entirely to this work. I have not conferred in this matter with Dr. Engles, but all our relations have been most cordial. This is a public matter, and we should be careful in the use of those contributions which come up from the church. I give all due honor to Dr. Engles' position and labors. I only desire to vindicate the action of the committee on this point."

The discussion was continued at great length, and the report was finally adopted, retaining the chief modifications in the organization of the Board which the committee had recommended. This brought forth the following protest, which was admitted to record:

"The undersigned hereby respectfully dissent from the action of the General Assembly by which the Board of Publication are restrained from the further accumulation of active capital to be employed in their operations, because

1. The capacity to serve the church efficiently by the operations of this Board depends in a great degree upon the amount of capital employed, and therefore the increase of capital ought to be commensurate with the growth of the church. To stop accumulation of capital implies either that no further growth of the church is expected, or else that such increase of membership is to be denied the advantages of this Board.

2. The questions determined by this act of the Assembly involve very complicated considerations not truly of a commercial character, but the relations of a publishing house to a system of colportage, which we believe may be more satisfactorily settled by such a Board of wise and

prudent Christian men as compose the Board of Publication of this church, than they can be by this Assembly during the brief period which it can bestow upon the consideration of them.

Signed by—H. K. Clark, Geo. Junkin, Jr., Wm. Blackburn, Thomas McKennan, J. H. M. Knox, Wm. D. Sinclair, A. D. White, D. Cook, S. E. Wier, Robert S. Manning, E. B. Fuller, A. T. Rankin, Thos. M. Gray, Chas. Hubbard, C. W. Stewart, W. E. Westervelt, J. S. Hellenstein, E. C. Wines, G. W. Lewis, G. S. Plumley, H. P. S. Willis, G. S. Inglis, J. A. Quarles, H. B. Thayer, E. E. Rankin, John Mack, L. C. Baker."

We do not feel competent to pass a perfectly confident judgment upon this entire action of the General Assembly, resulting in such serious changes in one of the great organic agencies of the church; for the matters are somewhat complicated, some of them are of a purely business and financial nature, and all of them require the most careful examination and thorough acquaintance, personal if possible, in order to render a judgment of much value. We will barely indicate a few things which appear obvious.

1. There seems to have been a disposition, for years past, to carp at the Boards of the church, at the meetings of the General Assembly. This has sometimes manifested itself in opposition to their existence altogether, but more frequently to the manner of their management. They have all had a serious, if not formal, overhauling, except that of Foreign Missions and that of Church Extension. We do not know why these two have escaped, unless the distant scene of the practical operations of the former, and the youth of the latter, have contributed to this exemption. It can not be that their management is infallible. Perhaps their day is coming; and now that the Board of Publication is disposed of, their turn may come in the next Assembly. When we speak of carping, we judge from what we have personally witnessed in the discussions of former years. We by no means condemn just criticism. The Boards are responsible to the whole church, through the General Assembly. If any person is displeased with their management, if serious faults exist, complaints and investigation may be required. But, as in other things, it is sometimes better to bear with some faults—or, if it can be done, seek a remedy in another way—than to bring

complaints into the Assembly, excite bitter discussions, indulge in severe condemnation of men of unblemished reputation (as has been observed, especially in former years), and thus tend to undermine the confidence of the church in these important instrumentalities for carrying on its great work.

2. No one can have witnessed the discussions to which we refer without the impression that there were matters of a personal nature mixed up with the measures taken and the ends sought. This is a great scandal. We do not profess to know what the merits of these personal differences may be among, chiefly, we believe, our good friends of the City of Brotherly Love. We trust there are merits in the case, and hope they perceive them more clearly than we do, or we are sorry for all concerned. But we exhort them to settle their personal differences hereafter at home, and not parade them before the whole church; at least, not bring them up, annually, to the Assembly.

3. The report of the Investigating Committee upon the Board of Publication is an able document. Full confidence is felt in the committee who made it, and we have no doubt the Assembly acted on its best judgment in adopting its chief recommendations. We have as little doubt, from the light we possess, that some of the radical changes made are unwise. We are led to this conclusion, partly from the views presented in the foregoing protest, partly from the experienced judgment expressed by men who have been connected with the Board from its origin, and who have published their views since the rising of the Assembly, and, in part, from what appears stamped upon the very surface of the case.

Retrenchment of expenditure is sometimes an economical, and sometimes a very expensive, affair, when ultimate interests are consulted; and we believe it was in the interest of retrenchment, for the most part, that these "reforms" suggested. That the insurance effected for the Secretary's benefit should be annulled, we think wise; not because of the amount—it was but a trifle—but from the principle involved, unless the Assembly is prepared to sanction the life insurance of all its agents who are similarly situated. We presume this is the only case of the life insurance of a secretary in any of the Boards by the funds of the church at large.



But most of the other reductions and changes we think decidedly injurious. Of the change respecting the Treasurer, however, we can not so well judge, not knowing the amount of labor the office imposes, or measure of responsibility incurred. Our opinion inclines to the side that it was a mistake. The case of the Editor, in our judgment, admits of little doubt. The Corresponding Secretary can not do the work of the Editor of the Board as it should be done, simply for want of time, without infringing upon his other duties, and thus injuring the interests of the Board in the most vital department, we hesitate not to say, of all its operations. It is a positive physical and intellectual impossibility, unless we have mistaken entirely what belongs to the duties, respectively of these offices.

But upon this whole subject of these or any other changes so radical, and especially about the amount of capital needed for the largest and most efficient amount of service for the church, we would rather submit the entire management of such a vast interest to a board of such experience, practical business, Christian men, as composed the Board of Publication located in Philadelphia, or in any other large commercial city, than to the judgment upon their acts for a given examination of the ablest committee any General Assembly ever appointed, and much sooner than to submit the matter for final decision to the wisest General Assembly, so large and pressed with so much business, that ever was convened in this country or any other. We think it will be found, in the end, and at no distant period, that many of these changes have proved injurious to those great interests which this Board was organized to promote.

The General Assembly is of course supreme on this theater. Its will must be obeyed whether its agents approve its decisions or not. The Board of Publication have made the changes required, and the experiment is to be tried. We sincerely regret, however, that we lose the services of such long-tried men as Drs. Engles and Boardman, and others from the councils of this Board.

## ACTION UPON SLAVERY.

We present, within a very moderate compass, all that was said and done upon this subject, in the late Assembly, so far as we find it reported in any of our religious journals:

The Committee on Bills and Overtures reported:

*Overture No. 16.*—Request from the Presbytery of Saline, that the General Assembly solemnly reaffirm the testimony of 1818, in regard to slavery, the committee report:

The Assembly has, from the first, uttered its sentiments upon the subject of slavery in substantially the same language. The action of 1818 was taken with more care, and made more clear, full and explicit, and was adopted unanimously. It has since remained that true and Scriptural deliverance on this important subject, by which our church is determined to abide. It has never been repealed, amended or modified, but has frequently been referred to and reiterated by subsequent Assemblies; and when some persons fancied that the action of 1845 in some way interfered with it, the Assembly of 1846 declared, with much unanimity, that the action of 1845 was not intended to deny or rescind the testimony on this subject previously uttered by General Assemblies; and by their deliverances we still abide.

The report was accepted.

Dr. Humphrey moved that the report be amended by inserting before the words 'these deliverances' the word 'all' making it read—'By all these deliverances we abide.'

Rev. Mr. Phraner urged the Assembly to reaffirm unanimously the action of 1818 upon this subject. The matter was one which had been handed down from that day unimpaired, and he desired to see it reaffirmed by a unanimous vote.

Dr. Nevin moved to lay the amendment on the table. Carried.

Dr. Humphrey moved to lay the whole subject on the table. Lost.

Dr. Nevin called for the ayes and nays. The call was not sustained.

The report of the committee was then adopted.

This action, as we understand it, leaves the testimony of the Assembly where it has stood from the beginning, merely reiterating, in plain language, the judgment of the fathers of the church, North and South.

## STATE OF THE CHURCH AND THE COUNTRY.

The Assembly adopted two very important papers on this subject, which we present in full. As the matter was brought to the notice of the body upon an incidental question, without the design apparently to introduce the whole subject of the relations of the church to the State—as a *reconnaissance* sometimes brings on a battle unintentionally—we give the preliminary debate arising upon this question. The following is an account of the initiatory proceedings, which were taken on the sixth day of the sessions:

“Elder T. H. Nevin moved that a committee of three should be appointed to raise the flag of the country over the church. To this motion he did not anticipate any opposition.

Mr. Valentine hoped the motion would not pass. There was no necessity of placarding or testifying their loyalty. We have now floating over us the flag of Jesus Christ, bearing upon it Christ and Him crucified. There was no necessity for dragging in at this time of outside agitation, questions which serve only to distract debate. Though the flag was never loved so much as now, though at this time it was necessarily dear to us, yet we had unfurled the flag of Jesus Christ and none other should supplant it. The loyalty of the Assembly was undoubted, it needed no outside testimonial to that effect.

Rev. H. C. Reed opposed the resolution. He did not think the Assembly needed this evidence of its loyalty after the many prayers that had been offered for the welfare of the country in the Assembly. He had heard of an artist who painted an animal and wrote under it, ‘this is a dog.’ He did not think we needed anything of this kind.

A motion to lay the above motion on the table called forth the ayes and noes.

Rev. Mr. Plumbly rose to a question of privilege. He desired the member moving the motion would take some action which should relieve the Assembly from this unpleasant predicament.

Mr. Conger asked to be excused from voting. The Assembly refused to grant the request, and he voted ‘No.’ The vote resulted as follows: ayes, 90; noes, 129; total, 219. And the motion to lay it upon the table was lost.

Mr. Delancy stated there was one consideration which had not yet been presented. Though he had voted to lay the motion upon the table, yet he had no objection if the trustees desired it, that the American flag should be raised. But the church was in the hands of the trustees to do with it as they saw fit. The Assembly had no right to use property

which did not belong to them. He therefore moved that the matter be referred to the trustees of the church for them to do as they thought proper. He did not wish to be placed in a false position. He left New Orleans when the last American flag was torn down there, and wept tears of joy when, six months after, it floated over the court-house in the city of Louisville.

Mr. Sheddan sustained the motion of Mr. Delancy, and for similar reasons.

Rev. Mr. Young stated that the pastor of the church authorized him to say that he would be pleased to have the flag of his country raised upon the church, and he doubted not the trustees would concur. The church, he said, had been passed to the service of the Assembly and the ownership of the church for the time being was vested in the Assembly.

Mr. Delancy demurred: If by this or any other act of the Assembly he asked, the church should be destroyed, who would assume the responsibility?

Mr. Young continued: The trustees, he doubted not, would be pleased to have the flag thus raised. So far as he himself was concerned, he could not regard any man who was not in favor of raising the flag of his country over every place wherever he was, as exhibiting a great degree of love for his country.

The Rev. Mr. Brownson did not wish to impeach the loyalty of any man upon the floor of the Assembly. He himself would throw out no imputation to that effect, but he was at a loss to conceive what objection could be reasonably made to the proposed demonstration.

The Rev. Dr. Nevin regarded the matter as one of importance. It had been asserted that there were no disloyal men upon the floor of the Assembly; but there were those at least who were suspected of disloyalty, and those who had been arraigned in their own locality because of such suspicion.

The Rev. Mr. Beers said where he was known no one doubted his loyalty. He objected to the raising of the flag upon the church merely upon the ground of expediency, and for this reason had voted to lay the resolution upon the table. It was not necessary to attest the loyalty of the Assembly by windy and wordy resolutions, or by similar acts. They were not assembled for that purpose, nor was it rendered imperative, for their loyalty was undoubted. He did not regard this a matter which should be called a question of loyalty or disloyalty. For himself, he had four brothers who had enlisted in the service of their country, one of whom had laid down his life upon the field of battle, and he himself would make the fifth before this rebellion should succeed. While he did not object to the raising of the flag as an expression of patriotism; he did not think this the proper place or time to do it.

Dr. Humphrey, of Kentucky, said the flag was the symbol of the country, and we all love it. He did not suppose that Dr. Nevin intended to impeach the loyalty of any person on the floor, and particularly those who came from a section of country where it cost something to be loyal. When Congress was in session the flag of the country was raised above the capitol at the commencement of its deliberations, and lowered again at its adjournment, in order that the public might be informed when those legislative councils were in session. As a national body, sitting in the name of the people and the country, this was eminently proper, but it was not called for in a body sitting in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ. And, sir, said the speaker, it has not been the custom of the Presbyterian Church in this country at any time to recognize symbols. Even the sacred symbol of the cross, typical of the suffering and death of the beloved Master, was not placed upon the church. Symbols of any kind were not recognized, and had not been, and especially at this time was it unnecessary. The speaker detailed the practice and method of opening the church or kirk in Scotland, and drew from it a comparison between the manner there and custom attendant upon the opening of public assemblies of that nature in this country. Will we gain anything, asked the reverend gentleman, by a divided vote upon this question? Upon this motion to lay upon the table, 90 have voted for it, and 129 against it. That, sir, is a very large representation, and is it to be said that the Assembly is divided upon this subject? Shall it go forth to the world, that on such a subject as this, the Assembly stands one against the other? Will it, he asked, help them much in the Border States, where we desire to preserve the church intact? Sir, it is not without much effort and labor that we are now enabled to do this, and how much more difficult will it be if these matters are to be permitted to convulse and exercise the minds of members. Undoubtedly, sir, the church is loyal, and no one can safely question it. Read all that has been said, witness all that has been done, and is there anything which can be construed as disloyal? Then, I beseech you, let me plead the cause of my brethren in the Border States. It requires there the exercise already of a spirit of peace and forbearance to preserve the church intact, to keep it in its purity, and uncontaminated with matters which in no wise relate to it. And we must do all we can to maintain it. Sir, we love our church—perhaps some of us even better than our country. Beyond all things else, our faith stands foremost in our affections. But, sir, this resolution can do you but little good, in the North, and it certainly will do us none in the Border States.

A member: How will it do harm in the Border States?

Dr. Humphrey: By kindling excitement and giving rise to agitation in the church in the Border States. He did not desire to enter into

argument to show why it was so, for if he did, he would be obliged to bring into controversy names and circumstances which he had no inclination to mention upon this floor. The brethren knew him, and knew him well. You, Mr. Moderator, know that I am a New Englander, but for many years have resided in Kentucky. The ashes of my parents are in Kentucky; the ashes of my children repose in Massachusetts and in the former State. I have stood in my own home when the enemy's bullets whistled about his house and family. He had seen the practical workings of the rebellion. What he had offered in this connection he had presented candidly, and trusted it would be taken in the same spirit. Let it be received for what it is worth.

Dr. J. M. Lowrie said that Dr. Humphrey had stated a divided vote on this subject would injure us abroad. Well, let all the members vote the right way, and no harm will be done. But there was another way of reaching the matter, and he would, therefore, move that the whole subject be referred to a committee of seven, who should report to this Assembly. This motion was then seconded, and Dr. Lowrie proceeded to speak to it. He would further say, that while there was some conflict among the members in regard to political matters, he yet thought there was no doubt of their loyalty. If it was true, as stated, that the general principles of our church excluded the use of symbols, there can yet be no inconsistency in hanging out this flag, for it took the place of no symbol of the church, nor excluded any. It would simply hang as an evidence of our loyalty and devotion to it.

Dr. Beatty was in favor of the motion to appoint a committee. He voted to lay the original motion upon the table, but even his best friends favored it. He did not doubt the loyalty of any man in the house. Mr. Young, who was his warm friend, had said he did not regard a man as loyal, who objected to seeing the flag floating in every place. The flag floated over his own house and home. It was the flag his father fought under, and the flag he loved. But he objected to a flag floating over a church, because he did not regard it as the proper place.

Mr. Young explained. He wished to be understood as saying, that he did not regard a man as loyal who objected to seeing the flag float over the whole country.

Dr. Beatty: Probably the brother meant that, but he was not so understood. I am satisfied with his explanation, but I did not like his sweeping assertion. The divided vote placed the Assembly in a false position. He protested against this false representation before the world. It carried the idea of a disregard for the flag, when such was not the case. No one objected to the act, as a display of patriotism, but others with himself thought this not the proper place for it."

The original motion, as amended, to refer the matter to a committee of seven, was then adopted. The next morning, Mr.

Goodall moved "that the whole subject of our relations to the country," be referred to this committee, which was adopted. The Moderator appointed as this committee, Rev. Drs. J. M. Lowrie, E. P. Humphrey, Loyal Young, and James I. Brownson; and Judges H. H. Leavitt and Hovey K. Clarke, and Robert Carter, Esq.

This committee, through their chairman, Rev. Dr. J. M. Lowrie, subsequently presented the following report:

"The committee to whom was referred the resolution which proposed to raise the flag of the United States upon the building in which the Assembly is now convened, and to report in respect to the state of the country, respectfully present the following report:

Your committee believe that the design of the mover of the original resolution and of the large majority, who, apparently, are ready to vote for its adoption, is simply to call forth from the Assembly a significant token of our sympathy with this Government in its earnest efforts to suppress a rebellion, that now for over two years has wickedly stood in armed resistance to lawful and beneficent authority. But as there are many among us who are undoubtedly patriotic, who are willing to express any righteous principle to which this Assembly should give utterance, touching the subjection and attachment of an American citizen to the Union and its institutions, who love the flag of our country and rejoice in its successes by sea and by land, and who yet do not esteem this particular act a testimonial of loyalty entirely becoming to a church court; and, as many of these brethren, by the pressing of this vote, would be placed in a false position, as if they did not love the Union, of which that flag is the beloved symbol, your committee deem themselves authorized by the subsequent direction of the Assembly to propose a different action to be adopted by this venerable court.

It is well known, on the one hand, that the General Assembly has ever been reluctant to repeat its testimonies upon important matters of public interest; but, having given utterance to carefully considered words, is content to abide calmly by its recorded deliverances. Nothing that this Assembly can say can more fully express the wickedness of the rebellion that has cost so much blood and treasure; can declare, in plainer terms, the guilt before God and man, of those who have inaugurated, or maintained, or countenanced, for so little cause, this fratricidal strife; or can more impressively urge the solemn duty of the Government to the lawful exercise of its authority, and of the people, each in his several place, to uphold the civil authorities, to the end that law and order may again reign throughout the entire nation; than these things have already been done by previous Assemblies. Nor need this body declare its solemn rebukes toward those ministers and members of the Church of Christ,



who have aided in bringing on and sustaining these immense calamities ; or tender our kind sympathies to those who are overtaken by troubles they could not avoid, and who mourn and weep in secret places, not unseen by the Father's eye ; or reprove all willful disturbers of the public peace ; or exhort those that are subject to our care, to the careful discharge of every duty tending to uphold the free and beneficent government under which we are, and this specially for conscience' sake and as in the sight of God, more than in regard to all these things, the General Assembly has made its solemn deliverances since these troubles began.

But on the other hand, it may be well for this General Assembly to re-affirm—as it now solemnly does—the great principles to which utterance has already been given. We do this the more readily because our beloved church may thus be understood to take her deliberate and well-chosen stand, free from all imputations of haste or excitement ; because we recognize an entire harmony between the duties of the citizen (especially in a land where the people frame their own laws and choose their own rulers), and the duties of the Christian to the Great Head of the Church ; because, indeed, least of all persons, should Christian citizens even seem to stand back from their duty when bad men press forward for mischief ; and because a true love for our country in her times of peril should forbid us to withhold an expression of our attachment, for the insufficient reason that we are not accustomed to repeat our utterances.

And because there are those among us, who have scruples touching the propriety of any deliverance of a church court respecting civil matters, this Assembly would add, that all strifes of party politics, should indeed be banished from our ecclesiastical assemblies and from our pulpits ; that Christian people should earnestly guard against promoting partisan divisions ; and that the difficulty of accurately deciding, in some cases, what are general and what party principles, should make us careful in our judgments ; but that our duty is none the less imperative to uphold the constituted authorities, because minor delicate questions may possibly be involved. Rather, the sphere of the church is wider and more searching, touching matters of great public interest, than the sphere of the civil magistrate, *in this important respect*, that the civil authorities can take the cognizance only of overt acts, while the law of which the Church of God is the interpreter, searches the heart, makes every man subject to the civil authority for conscience' sake, and declares that man truly guilty who allows himself to be alienated in sympathy and feeling from any lawful duty, or who does not conscientiously prefer the welfare and especially the preservation of the government, to any party or partisan ends. Officers may not always command a citizen's confidence ; measures may by him be deemed unwise ; earnest, lawful efforts may be made for changes he may think desirable ; but no causes now exist to

vindicate the disloyalty of American citizens toward the United States Government.

This General Assembly would not withhold from the Government of the United States that expression of cordial sympathy which a loyal people should offer. We believe that God has afforded us ample resources to suppress this rebellion, and that with his blessing it will ere long be accomplished; we would animate those who are discouraged by the continuance and fluctuations of these costly strifes to remember and rejoice in the supreme government of our God who often leads through perplexity and darkness; we would exhort to penitence for all our national sins, to sobriety and humbleness of mind before the Great Ruler of all, and to constant prayerfulness for the Divine blessing; and we would entreat our people to beware of all schemes implying resistance to the lawfully constituted authorities, by any other means than are recognized as lawful to be openly prosecuted. And as this Assembly is ready to declare our unalterable attachment and adherence to the Union established by our fathers, and our unqualified condemnation of the rebellion; to proclaim to the world the United States, one and undivided, as our country; the lawfully chosen rulers of the land, our rulers; the Government of the United States, our civil government; and its honored flag, our flag; and to affirm that we are bound in the truest and strictest fidelity to the duties of Christian citizens under a government that has strewn its blessings with a profuse hand, your committee recommend that the particular act contemplated in the original resolution be no further urged upon the attention of this body.

The report was accepted.

Dr. Lowrie stated that the report was concurred in with the exception of Dr. Humphrey.

Dr. Humphrey stated that he found to his regret he could not concur with his brethren of the committee. He did not intend to submit a minority report; but when the matter came up for action before the Assembly, he would state his views upon the matter and present a substitute for the report."

When this paper came up for consideration, Rev. R. A. Delancy proposed an amendment to the last clause, which here follows, with the discussion upon it, together with the substitute for the whole paper presented by Dr. Humphrey, the discussion, and the final vote:

"Mr. Delancy desired to report the following amendment to the last clause:

The trustees of this church concurring in the desire expressed by many members of this Assembly to have displayed from this edifice the

American flag, the beautiful symbol of national protection, unity and liberty.

Dr. Humphrey objected to its introduction at this moment, thinking it might be more appropriately presented at a subsequent period.

Mr. Delaney's amendment was adopted.

Dr. Humphrey said he stated to the Assembly on Saturday that he had the unhappiness not to be able to agree with his brethren in the report submitted. He proposed to indicate a little different action, and submit a substitute. He had intended some remarks, but the time of the house was more precious and it is possible (he hoped they would escape it) they might be thrown into agitation. He was prepared for discussion, but in order to avoid all agitation he hoped the question would be taken entirely without debate. He would read his substitute in order that those present should vote understandingly, and he believed that there should be taken a religious view of the subject in such a body as this.

Dr. Humphrey's substitute is as follows :

The General Assembly of 1861 adopted a minute on the state of the church and the country. The Assembly of 1862 uttered a more formal and comprehensive deliverance. In the mean time a certain number, perhaps the larger portion, of the presbyteries and synods have expressed their judgments on the same subject. This General Assembly is persuaded that the office bearers and members of this church, with the presbyteries represented here, are, in a remarkable degree, united in a strict and true allegiance to the Constitution and Government of the United States ; and that they are, as a body, loyal both to the church and civil government as ordinances of God.

This General Assembly contents itself, on that part of the subject, by enjoining upon all the people of God, who acknowledge this church as their church to uphold, according as God shall give them strength, the authority of the Constitution and laws of the land in this time of supreme national peril. But this Assembly would most distinctly and solemnly inculcate upon all its people, the duty of humbly confessing before God the great unworthiness and the many sins of the people of this land, and of acknowledging the holiness and justice of the Almighty in the present visitation. He is righteous in all His ways and holy in all His works. We exhort our brethren to seek the gift of the Holy Ghost by prayer, confession and repentance, so that the anger of the Lord may be turned away from us, and that the spirit of piety may become not less predominant and vital in the church than the spirit of an awakened patriotism.

And this Assembly connecting the experience of our present trials with the remembrance of those through which the church has passed, does now recall and adopt the sentiments of our fathers in the Church of Scotland, as those are expressed for substance in the Solemn League

and Covenant of 1643: 'And because the people of this land are guilty of many sins and provocations against God and his Son Jesus Christ, as is manifest by our present distresses and danger, the fruits thereof we profess and declare before God and the world our unfeigned desire to be humbled for our own sins and the sins of the people especially that we have not as we ought valued the inestimable benefit of the gospel nor labored for the purity and power thereof; and that we have not as we ought endeavored to receive Christ in our hearts, nor to walk worthy of him in our lives which are the cause of other sins and the transgressions so much abounding among us; and our trust, unfeigned purpose, desire and endeavor for ourselves and all others under our charge, both in public and private, in all duties we owe to God and man to amend our lives, and each one to go before another in the example of a real reformation, that the Lord may turn away his wrath and heavy indignation, and establish the church and the land in truth and peace.'

Dr. H. continued: He would be happy to see the questions upon all these subjects taken without debate, and offered his paper as an amendment, striking out of the original report all after the first paragraph and substituting the one offered by him.

The original report of the committee was then read by the Stated Clerk.

The members of the Assembly took occasion to express their opinions liberally upon the proposition to pass upon the respective papers without debate.

Dr. Wines moved that the subject be postponed to afternoon, and that the two papers be printed this forenoon for the use of the Assembly.

Judge Leavitt moved that the whole subject be referred to a special committee to consist of Drs. Humphrey and Lowrie.

Dr. Wines and Dr. Nevin opposed such reference for the reason that several had remained over for the special purpose of voting upon this subject.

Rev. Mr. Sheddan was in favor of recommitment for the reason that he believed the two papers could be combined and such a paper could be produced as would meet the concurrence of all, and if the 'disloyal 90' could stay a day longer to vote upon it certainly the other side could do the same thing.

Dr. Humphrey stated that he was sorry to say that he did not believe that the chairman of the committee and himself could agree as to which should be the predominant tone of the paper, religious or patriotic. His idea was that the report of the committee should recommend humiliation of the church before God, while the committee believed the prevailing tone of the report should be patriotic.

Judge Leavitt's motion to recommit was lost.

The question then recurring upon Dr. Wines' motion to postpone consideration till afternoon, it was lost.

The Rev. Mr. Plumley moved an amendment to the amendment, that all of the report of the committee be stricken out, with the exception of the amendment of Mr. Delancy.

The reading of Dr. Humphrey's paper was again called for, which was read.

The previous question, having been called for, was ordered.

The question then recurring upon the original report submitted by Dr. Lowrie, and amended by Mr. Delancy, the ayes and noes were called for, and the call was sustained.

The vote was then announced as follows :

Ayes, 176 ; noes, 20.

On motion privilege was granted those absent to subsequently record their names.

Rev. Mr. McMillen, of Kentucky, was, by request, excused from voting.

Dr. Hickok then moved the adoption of Dr. Humphrey's paper, with a slight modification. A motion to amend by adopting the whole paper was accepted, and the ayes and noes being taken upon it resulted in its adoption. All the members voting in the affirmative with the exception of E. S. Wilson, of Vincennes, Indiana.

On motion those not present at the time the vote was taken were permitted to record their votes."

One other item completes the record of this exciting and important business, and we present it, as follows:

"Rev. Mr. Baker presented the following protest against the action of the Assembly, with the request that it be entered upon the records, viz.:

The undersigned beg leave to protest against the action of the General Assembly in adopting the report of the Committee on the State of the Country ; because while on the one hand it rightly denounces rebellion, and enjoins the duty of reverence and obedience to the powers that be, on the other it fails to recognize the fundamental antagonism there is between the kingdom of Christ in its origin, progress and destiny, and every form of the world-power, not founded upon it."

This action upon the condition of the church and the country calls for no particular notice at our hands. The position which the *Danville Review* has taken, from the first, upon this whole subject, is well known. It is, with all its conductors, unmistakably loyal to the Government and the Union, in our present struggle for National existence.

We can not forbear, however, noticing one feature of the movement in the Assembly—the initiatory step—by a passing remark. The proposition for a flag raising, by a vote of the General Assembly, was what the language of the times would characterize as partaking rather too much of the “sensational” and “spread-eagle” order of doing things, for such a body. At least, this is our opinion. The discussion showed that it was not, on either side, made a test of loyalty, and the decision arrived at was wise.

Where a congregation manifests, as in some instances has been the case, open disloyalty, and the military authorities order the flag to be hoisted upon the church edifice, willing obedience or otherwise becomes a proper test. In that case, the order should be obeyed. So, if the trustees of a congregation choose to raise the flag where a presbytery, or a synod, or the General Assembly, may sit, so be it. But the eagerness which has often been noticed, in some places, to raise the United States flag upon churches, to display it within the church, and to cover the pulpit with it—not even with the excuse of a national day, as the anniversary of our independence, or a national fast day, but upon occasions of ordinary Sabbath worship—when nobody suspected the loyalty of the people there worshipping, when there seemed to be no occasion for it, except to make a vain parade; all this we regard as wholly unbecoming the dignity and gravity which should mark all the proceedings of religious bodies, and the worship of our ordinary religious assemblies.

#### INTEGRITY OF THE CHURCH—WITHDRAWAL OF THE SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIES AND SYNODS.

The question has been up in different forms—sometimes at the opening of the General Assembly when making up or subsequently calling the roll, sometimes when electing members of the several Boards, and again when determining the form of the printed Minutes, and in other ways—whether the presbyteries and synods, which the public well knew had formally withdrawn from all connection with the General Assembly, and had formed a Southern General Assembly, should still be regarded as an integral portion of the Presbyterian Church in the United States.

This question was discussed, at some length, in the Assembly of 1862, and the decision was, or rather the tacit understanding (for we believe no decision was entered in the proceedings), that the schism should be ignored, and the church regarded, in form at least, as not divided. Hence, the clerk, with solemn voice and grave countenance, on calling presbyteries and synods at that Assembly, called over the names of ten synods and forty-four presbyteries, beginning with the Presbytery of Greenbrier, in the Synod of Virginia, and ending with the Presbytery of Central Texas, in the Synod of Texas, although everybody knew there was not a single member on the floor from any of those ten synods and forty-four presbyteries, and that there would not be. And hence, also, determined to carry out this idea of the church intact, when the statistical tables of that year were printed, the Minutes exhibited some forty continuous pages of blank reports from these presbyteries. And, as a still further illustration of the same idea, at least one of the Boards—that of Publication—in its “Statement of Receipts for Colportage,” in its Annual Report made to the Assembly of 1863, parades, in its tables, the full list of these presbyteries and synods by name, from which, of course, as the formidable array of blank lines shows, it received nothing. These are some of the forms which the idea of unbroken unity assumed.

This process of roll-calling, in the Assembly of 1862, was too ludicrous for long continuance, and we believe was not repeated more than once. It reminds us of a similar proceeding, equally grave, which we witnessed in the Senate of the United States soon after the secession of States began, in the winter of 1861. Great men, in both state and church, have made progress in their views of the rebellion since then. At every call in the Senate for the ayes and noes, even after all the senators, from all the States that had seceded, had gone, the Secretary, having no authority to do otherwise, called the name of every senator, secessionists and all. At length, certain members getting tired of the proceeding, the question was raised, whether the members from the seceded States should be called, and the majority decided that their *seats* must be recognized, whether anybody was in them or not. Hence, the call went on, and a dozen times a day the farce



was played, to the amusement of all lookers-on. We are not sure, but believe it was the same in the house of Representatives. This practice, however, terminated with the session of Congress, ending on the 4th of March, 1861. No roll-call of rebel senators or representatives was heard in either branch at the special session which convened on the 4th of July, 1861, nor at any of the regular sessions held since. Their designs were too well known, after the guns of Sumter, to statesmen and politicians of all grades and parties, to lead any one to suppose they would ever voluntarily return to occupy the vacated seats.

At the Assembly of 1863, some progress was made, touching the matter of continuing to recognize the presbyteries and synods referred to, so far as bore upon the integrity of the church. Although the Narrative adopted—a most excellent paper—laments that, “from the presbyteries embraced within the lines of the atrocious rebellion now desolating the southern portion of country, we have received no reports”—keeping up the idea of a church intact—yet, in several particulars, the Assembly took action, after earnest discussion, which implied that it regarded the division of the church an accomplished fact. Among the last things done, Dr. Beatty moved, “That in our printed minutes, presbyteries in the southern synods, who make no report to the Assembly, be omitted,” and the motion was carried. This, of course, was not aimed at such presbyteries as occasionally, in all parts of the church, fail to send up reports; but plainly was intended for those embraced within the schism, and identified with the southern Assembly. The Assembly was fully prepared for this by what had previously taken place. The question had arisen in another form, on a prior day, and had been fully considered. It was brought up, incidentally, in the report of the committee on the Annual Report of the Board of Education. The whole proceeding is interesting, and we give the account as we find it in one of our religious journals:

“One section of this report, striking from the list of members of this Board the names of a number of gentlemen now in the South, and who had allied themselves with the new southern church, elicited a warm discussion, and was rejected by the Assembly, several delegates declaring it contrary to the constitution to decide that the

places of these members were vacant before their terms had expired. A subsequent motion to reconsider this action was also discussed at great length, one member urging that if they had no law which would admit of excluding these gentlemen from the Board, it was time the Assembly made one. The motion was finally adopted. The question then recurring upon the original motion, striking out the resolution of the committee, an amendment was offered, striking from the section the names of Dr. Dabney and Dr. Leland. On motion of W. C. Lawson, the matter was then referred to the committee on the Board of Education, with instructions to examine into the authority of the Assembly to take action in this regard. This committee immediately reported back the section modified in accordance with this motion, upon which it was adopted, and the names of Dr. Dabney, Dr. Leland and Major D. H. Hill were erased."

The question, it thus appears, was up for consideration several times, earnestly canvassed at great length, recommitted, again reported and considered, and, after having been decided in opposite ways, was finally settled to the apparent satisfaction of the Assembly. We find no part of this debate reported, nor any more full account of it than we have here introduced, nor does it appear that the votes were recorded. All of this we regret, for the matters involved concerned principles of a radical nature, as bearing upon the integrity of the church and the character of the schism which had caused its disruption, and evidently the Assembly was much divided in opinion.

D. H. Hill, mentioned above, is an elder in the Presbyterian Church, and was a member of the General Assembly, at Indianapolis, in 1859, from North Carolina. He was a professor in a military institute in the South, and is now a major general in the rebel army. Rev. Dr. Dabney was, and perhaps still is, a professor in the Union Theological Seminary in Virginia. If truly reported, he was one of the staff of the famous "Stonewall Jackson," another elder. The military character or warlike exploits of these gentlemen, whose names, with that of the venerable Dr. Leland, professor in the Columbia, South Carolina, Theological Seminary, were dropped by the Assembly, had nothing to do with determining its action. We accept it as the recognition of a notorious fact concerning the division of the church. We may therefore regard the

question settled, so far as this action of the Assembly can settle it. The Assembly has recognized the schism, by this positive decision, and no longer regards those ten synods and forty-four presbyteries as a part of the church in connection with the General Assembly. These incidental matters, upon which the question turned, have decided the point as clearly as any more formal deliverance could have done, for the principle of integrity and disruption was involved in them.

The state and the church here occupy different ground. Whatever may be true of the nation, now or ultimately, the church is sundered, and it was well, therefore, in the General Assembly, to accept the fact, and act accordingly. No one supposes that in the final action of the two Houses of Congress upon the vacated seats of senators and representatives, any recognition of a separation of the States, or severance of the Union, or acknowledgment of secession, or divided nationality, in any way, was intended. On the contrary, in every patriotic utterance in each branch of Congress there was a rigid maintenance of the doctrine that we are one people still, have one constitution, one government, and that our territory is one and undivided; and, in order to make all this good in fact, as it is claimed to be in form, the nation is putting forth its strength by the sword. If successful, the national integrity will be preserved. This use of compulsory force is within the legitimate province of the civil power, and among its acknowledged rights.

But the church stands on different ground. It must acquiesce in its own disruption. It has no power to prevent it if it would; nor can it restore any portion that may choose to continue separated from the main body. And, also, leaving wholly out of view the question of power, even its rightful authority, touching the whole matter of schism, especially as this is most commonly illustrated in practice in all branches of the Protestant Church, is qualified and limited according to circumstances. A minister, viewing his usefulness or happiness in his ecclesiastical relations, or for other reasons satisfactory to himself, not involving heresy or immorality, may withdraw from one branch and join another; and generally no proceedings are taken, if matters are conducted with due respect toward the body forsaken, further than to drop his

name from the roll, or in some other way recognize his departure, either with or without detailing the circumstances. Such cases are occurring constantly in all branches of the church. They occur in our own, and acquiescence is given; and that, too, not upon the ground of inability to prevent it, but upon the higher ground of ecclesiastical principle—that every man is left free to choose his ecclesiastical relations, and free to change them, being responsible only to the Head of the church. A man, indeed, is free from man and from the church upon the whole matter of faith and practice; much more, then, as to the outward form of alliance he shall make or maintain with the church. No individual, however, should break off from the church, and form new relations, without good reasons, for it tends to unsettle others, and to demoralize and destroy the whole body, and the evil is generally in proportion to the standing and influence of the person. If it be a minister, it is more noted, and the evil more extended. But when the question of separation rises to a higher level, and concerns a congregation, or a presbytery, or a synod, or several of them, the gravity of the case is greatly enhanced. Other principles of moral propriety enter into it besides those which environ an individual, or which even concern the mere extent of the separation of ecclesiastical bodies, and the influence immediately consequent thereupon. By such separation, a new sect may be formed, or many of them, new antagonisms developed in the body of Christ, and thus the evils of the spectacle, now presented to the world from the numerous and contending bodies into which Christians are divided, may become immeasurably diversified in character, and intensified in power, and the cause of truth be subverted or greatly hindered. These and a variety of other considerations are to be taken into the account in determining the true character of any case of disruption, and especially should we weigh the causes alleged, real or supposed, impelling thereto; while, at the same time, we grant perfect freedom of action to Christian bodies as to individuals, within the bounds of reason and propriety, in determining their own ecclesiastical relations, and freely admit the want of either power or authority in the church to prevent it.

While, therefore, in some cases, a separation of the church

may be warranted, it is nevertheless clear that if the reasons are not justifiable in any case, the disruption is schism, and schism is a sin, reaching far and wide. The Scriptures characterize it as a sin of uncommon turpitude, in proportion to its elements, magnitude, and results. It is nothing less than a ruthless rending of the very body of the Redeemer. It is placed in open contrast with one of the highest types of Christianity, and one of the brightest exhibitions of grace—the unity of Christ's body, in a union of the members with one another through the Spirit, and the union by the Spirit of each and all with Christ and in Him, even as Christ and the Father are one.

Now, as to the presbyteries and synods which have broken off from ours and formed the Southern General Assembly, while we can not justify the disruption upon any grounds alleged or known, still we are obliged to recognize the fact that they have gone. The separation was their own act, and theirs alone. We have acquiesced in it. We think the manner of acquiescence by the General Assembly was, perhaps, on the whole, the best way to meet the case.

There was no sufficient cause for separation on their part. *It was schism.* Their course was taken, in some instances, before and wholly independent of the action of the General Assembly in 1861, as many facts published by themselves plainly show; and in every case, without any warrant arising out of the action, at any time or in any manner, *of the church* from which they departed. It was the course of things pending *in the State* which shaped their policy, and was allowed to decide their destiny. The church trailed its garments in the dust and obsequiously chained itself to the chariot of the world. In some cases it was content with following the civil power, bowing submissively to its decrees, regarding the secession of a state as calling for a disruption of the church. In other cases it anticipated the civil power. Even before the secession of a single one of the states of the Union, the Synod of South Carolina, by the most deliberate and formal action, decided to cast in its fortunes with those of the state of that name, promising to follow where it should lead; to sever itself bodily from the church even as the state would withdraw itself from the Union. This was all the more remarkable, and illustrates the madness of the times and of the act, as

coming from those who had so stoutly maintained the total disconnection of the church from any alliance with the civil power, and had so constantly manifested an apparently deep-seated and holy horror at mixing things spiritual and secular.

Nor was there any necessity for this course, even admitting the hastily assumed fact that the civil disruption would be permanent; no necessity whatever, even in that case, for ecclesiastical separation, much less any antecedent necessity for declaring in favor of it, to the encouragement of the State in its revolt, but in this light there was every thing against it. The finality of a civil disruption might make the separation of the church *desirable*. It could not make it *essential*. When Texas was a department of Mexico, our church extended there, and its presbytery was connected with and a constituent part of a synod in the United States—the Synod of Mississippi—whose boundaries extended indefinitely in that direction, and this presbytery was represented in the General Assembly. When, subsequently, Texas became an independent republic, breaking off from Mexico by revolution, the relations of our church in that nation were not disturbed. When, still later, that republic became one of the states of the Union, our ecclesiastical affairs there remained the same. Amid all these mutations of the civil power, through scenes of violence and civil war, and under three different and successive nationalities, our church remained intact, spreading its ample banner over the whole; and the only ecclesiastical change which occurred was one of expansion and progress, with still preserved unity, beginning with the single Presbytery of Texas, when Texas was a department of Mexico, and ultimately multiplying itself into three presbyteries and becoming the Synod of Texas under the last phase the civil power assumed.

And why might it not have been so in the rebel states of the South? Even though the men of the church there, had absolutely foreseen as certain, that the issue of secession, whether with war or without, would be two nations, still this need not have resulted in two churches. No one can say that the unity of the church would then have been an impossibility, any more than this could have been alleged, antecedently to the event, in the case of the church in Texas under the several changes

which the civil power assumed. Whatever would have been *expedient*, separation would not have been a *necessity*. And we say, therefore, that it should not have occurred, in any event, except on grounds of the most pressing urgency, and never under the circumstances in which it was initiated; for, taking any possible view of the case, and nothing under heaven can justify the hot haste of the Synod of South Carolina, in its action taken in the autumn of 1860; and scarcely can we attribute a conceivable motive for this procedure, unless it were to give the earliest possible aid and comfort to that state, which was now starting out on its own fearful mission of treason and rebellion. Such a purpose seems well sustained by the facts. Nothing admits of clearer evidence, of their own showing, than that some of the leading men of our church in that general region were among the foremost in advocating a disruption of the nation. They were so eager for it that they did not tarry for its initiatory forms to be settled in a single State. They did not wait to see what might be the issues of measures, which, upon all reasonable calculations, would inevitably result in an open and bloody civil war. Willing to risk all, they shot ahead of the fiery politicians around them, and staked the fortunes of the church upon the upshot of the disputed dogma of "secession." They counseled secession; they prayed for it; they preached it; they longed for it and labored for it; they rejoiced over and gloried in it; and as a most natural consequence, some of these same men of the church have taken up arms and are fighting for it. Had these prominent men—standing forth for the true and the right with genuine Christian heroism, to which they should have been impelled by every principle of reason and Scripture, and by the demands of their sacred vocation and official position—used as valiantly their influence against as they did for this astounding treason, we verily believe the political leaders would not have been able to carry out their wicked designs with the people. But, at the very outset, they cast the whole weight of their social, religious, and official power into the opposite scale, sustained and encouraged political demagogues, and they are, therefore, before earth and heaven conspicuously responsible for secession and all its horrible consequences, the full sense of which no one can foresee.



Disruption itself, of the church, even though initiated under circumstances of less indecent haste, would have been, if there were not the most amply justifying causes, a schism of stupendous magnitude—always a sin of deep dye in the light of the divine word; but as it actually occurred, all its accompaniments and alliances stamp it with peculiar wickedness.

As to the *causes* which operated to produce the division of the church, they were the same substantially which led to the disruption of the nation; and hence the secret of the eagerness of the leading men of the church to identify its fortunes with those of the state. Taking the testimony of the chief actors in both spheres, and all the causes are reducible to one. The highest authority among their statesmen makes slavery “the corner stone” of their new system of government, and boasts that it stands without a parallel in the history of mankind; while it was to secure this element of their social and political life from the apprehended harm to which a longer continuance in the Federal Union would expose it, that they determined to withdraw from the Union. This view, engendered proximately by the result of a presidential election, led to the fatal step. The leading men of the church, partaking of this apprehension, at once resolved on a course for the church, corresponding to what their politicians were about taking for the state. And the leaders of both classes have formally presented these apprehensions to the public, and appealed to mankind for justification in sundering both the political and ecclesiastical ties which bound us together as one, declaring it to be, in the language of one of the most eloquent divines among them, “the providential mission of the South to conserve, perpetuate, and extend” that institution which they make “the corner stone” of their system.

Or, give them the full benefit of their own putting of the case in another form, as we have seen it stated, the ground on which is based the justification of this twin disruption, was the long growing antagonism between the northern and southern portions of the church and of the country upon the subject of slavery; and yet, an antagonism for which those in rebellion are chiefly responsible, springing out of the notorious fact of a radical and total revolution in their opinions on the subject, the extreme southern portion of the church and

of the country having forsaken the doctrines of the fathers which were cherished by men of the church and the world alike both north and south, and having made, for years past, strenuous exertions to improve their newly-discovered wisdom through demands for slavery, which had never before been dreamed of by any men in any stage of our history. In a word, the underlying cause of this whole movement in church and state, the chief actors themselves being witnesses, was to gain immunities, safeguards, guaranties, expansion, and perpetuity, to an institution which the very measures taken for these ends are destined to destroy, and that speedily; and along with its destruction, to carry desolation to every material and social interest of the people inaugurating the plot. Such is the short-sightedness of human wisdom, such the madness of human folly, and such the circumventing providence and avenging hand of an All-seeing God!

But while we record all this, and record it with pain and mortification, and while this stupendous schism of ten synods and forty-four presbyteries, with honorable exceptions of individual members—whether we take it as affecting simply the integrity of Christ's church, in all its interests in this land for time present and to come, or take it in its indelible history as early instigating and closely allied with all the progress what the Narrative justly terms an "atrocious rebellion" within the state—stands forth a gigantic iniquity; still we cheerfully bow to this as a dispensation of providence, to be overruled, as we believe, to glorious ends for the purification both of the church and the nation, and leave the unwilling agents of this work, who "mean not so," in the hands of God to reap the fruit of their doings.

Some have thought that the General Assembly should have pronounced directly upon the schism, and condemned it. We think otherwise. The church has spoken out plainly and manfully, again and again, upon the rebellion, and upon the church as concerned in it through the agency of influential ministers and members. There let the matter rest. As for the schism, let it stand rebuked by a simple purgation of the roll. Let it, with all its concomitants, go down together to posterity in its true character, upon the naked issue made, and there can be but one judgment among those who shall

come after us—that the deeds of men with whom “we took sweet counsel and walked unto the house of God in company,” by their eagerly uniting schism with treason and rebellion, go largely toward making up that fearful record of crime, written in tears and agony and blood—and not even yet fully written—which marks the darkest page in the annals of human history!

---

ART. III.—STUDIES ON THE BIBLE, No. V. *Israel in the Wilderness.\**

WHEN the Hebrews left the land of Egypt and filed off into the wilderness of the Red Sea, it is right to imagine that the mind of Moses was occupied with the painful contrast between the spiritual position and the moral obliquity of the moving hosts before him. By position, as he well knew, they composed the church of the living God. Jehovah had said to him “Israel is my son, even my first-born;” “Say unto the children of Israel, I will take you to me for a people, and I will be to you for a God.” Ex. iv: 22, vi: 7. In the Book of Genesis, if it were at that time in writing, Moses had shown that they were the direct heirs of the covenant, whereby Abraham and his posterity were set apart as the chosen seed. Beyond all doubt the church of God was then in existence, and

\*HELPS TO THE STUDY.—*Arabia Petraea*. Robinson's Researches, Vol. I. Stanley's Sinai and Palestine. Colenso's Pent., Part I: 118-187. Green's Reply, 86-102. Benisch's do., 29-59.

*The Pillar of Cloud*: Kurtz, ii: 344. Palfrey's Lectures, i: 149. Bush on Exodus, ii: 164-293. Fairbairn, ii: 77. Calvin, Rosenmüller, Von Gerlach, etc., on Exodus.

*The Passage of the Red Sea*: Robinson's Res., i: 57. Kitto's Cycl., Art. Exodus. Kurtz, ii: 352. Smith's Dict. Bib., Art. Exodus. N. Brit. Rev., Nov., 1857: 279.

*The Manna*: Kurtz, iii: 25-44. Fairbairn, ii: 61. Stanley's Jewish Church, 162.

*The Smitten Rock*: Kurtz, iii: 47. Tacitus' Hist., B. 5 § 3. 4. Oldshansen, Hodge, etc., on 1 Cor. x: 4.

*Amalek*: Kurtz, iii: 48. Calvin's Com.

*Typology*: Fairbairn, Witsius' Cov'ts., Ernesti on Interpre.

was to be found, not among the Egyptians or the Amalekites or the Canaanites, but in the bosom of the Hebrew race. That race was, to use the language of Stephen the proto-martyr, "the church in the wilderness." Acts vii : 38. On the other hand, none had a keener sense than Moses of their delinquencies. There were holy men and women among them, such as Caleb, Joshua, and Miriam. But, with few exceptions, these "hosts of the Lord" were unworthy the name they bore. They had worshiped the gods of Egypt; they were in a great measure ignorant of the true God, and fatally corrupted by contact with the foul iniquities of Egypt. Long years of oppression had exhausted their manliness and courage, so that their own servility and unbelief had presented obstacles to their emancipation not less formidable than the obstinacy of Pharaoh. By what means shall their ignorance be enlightened, their passion for the worship of false gods be extirpated, and a complete reformation of public morals effected? God is able of the stones to raise up children unto Abraham; by what agencies will he work a transformation not less wonderful upon the degenerate seed of the patriarch?

The perils of the wilderness were also well known to Moses. The whole region was infested by barbarous and warlike tribes: Edom, Amalek, Moab, and Ammon. And, what was far more appalling, a vast and burning waste was before them, in which there was neither food nor water sufficient for so great a multitude. A few palm trees of the date bearing species were here and there to be found. Ex. xv : 27. The traveler might occasionally purchase from the native tribes small quantities of food and water. Deut. ii : 6, 28; Num. xx : 19. Possibly a few wells might be digged in the desert of Moab. Num. xxi : 14-18. The Hebrews took with them also their flocks and herds. Ex. xii : 32. If, as is commonly estimated, one hundred or a hundred and fifty thousand male lambs and kids of the first year were required for the celebration of the Passover at Sinai, the sheep and goats alone of the Hebrews must have numbered nearly two millions; furnishing, to a certain extent, milk and flesh for food, and leather, wool, and hair for clothing. But according to Moses himself, these flocks and herds, if slain, would hardly suffice the people for a single month. Num. xi : 22. Besides, how were these

flocks to be supported in the wilderness? Moses had found pastures for the sheep of his father-in-law among the valleys of Mount Horeb—Ex. iii: 1; but what were these few sheep compared with the vast herds of the Hebrews? And how were they to be sustained in the barren and waterless wastes of the desert of Paran?

The extent to which the wilderness furnished, in its natural productions, food for the Hebrews and forage for their cattle, can not perhaps be accurately determined. On the one hand, it is estimated that the population of the entire desert does not, at present, exceed five thousand souls; and the support which these obtain is exceedingly meager, although it is eked out by the perquisites and the plunder obtained from travelers. On the other hand, it is alleged that the region was anciently far more productive than at this time. Dr. Benisch, the eminent Jewish scholar, in his masterly reply to Colenso, adverts to the fact that Moses cast the dust, to which he had ground the golden calf, "into a brook that descended out of the mount." Deut. ix: 21. This occurred in the month of August, a season of the year when, as things now are, the beds of the mountain torrents are wholly dry. Dr. B. suggests that the same causes which produced one stream must have produced many others, and with them extensive pasture grounds, the whole indicating a thorough change in the meteorological conditions, and in the productiveness of the region. But these conclusions are liable to be invalidated by the presumption that the "brook which descended out of the mount" was, probably, the same that flowed, miraculously, from the stricken rock in Horeb.

There are, however, indications in Scripture of a certain degree of fertility at the time of the Exodus, in some parts of the desert. The Hebrews found pastures for their cattle near Mount Sinai, in midsummer, a period when, in modern times, the plains and wadys are almost wholly destitute of vegetation. Still further, numerous and powerful tribes dwelt in the wilderness. Moses speaks in general terms of "the nations" through the domains of which the Hebrews passed in their journey. Deut. xxix: 16. Amalek, Midian, and Edom are mentioned by name. The numerical strength of the Amalekites is expressed by several circumstances. Although

their home was along the border of Palestine, their warriors attacked the Hebrews at a point as far to the South as Rephidim, near Mount Sinai; and so formidable was the onslaught that Moses betook himself to prayer for divine assistance, Aaron and Hur holding up his hands. At a later period, Saul raised an army of not less than 210,000 men for the purpose of making war upon this tribe. Now from the greatness of the tribe, the inference is direct to the comparative fertility of the desert. This inference is strengthened by the fact that "Saul smote the Amalekites from Havilah until thou comest to Shur which is before Egypt." 1 Sam. xv: 7. This pursuit would have been extremely difficult if not impossible, if the region had been as desolate then as now; and as appears from the history of Napoleon's forced march from Cairo to Jaffa, in 1799; and the retreat of Ibrahim Pasha from Syria, in 1840. To this may be added the indications of former fertility which still linger in the desert. Ritter, whose authority is very high, finds traces "of a more universal and thorough cultivation of the soil, in former times, which reveals itself in the period of the most ancient Egyptians by their mining operations and settlements, and in the Christian period by Episcopal foundations, and the remains, which are scattered everywhere, of cloisters, hermitages, gardens, fields, and wells." (Green against Colenso, p. 95.) These circumstances enter into the right solution of the problem as to the subsistence of the flocks driven by the Hebrews into the wilderness. Some persons who do not doubt the miracle by which the people were fed, do yet hesitate upon the point of the feeding of their cattle by a divine interposition. These persons may find some contentment in the evidence now produced showing that the springs, and wells, and oases, and pastures of the wilderness were, at one time, more frequent and constant than now. But others less timid, who bear in mind the fact that water was miraculously supplied at Horeb and at Kadesh, both for the congregation "and their beasts also," will not doubt that God who hears the ravens when they cry, was able to open pastures in the wilderness and "turn the dry ground into water springs." Ps. cvii: 35.

But, although the truth of history requires that a candid estimate be formed of the natural resources of the wilderness,

all the facts point steadily to the conclusion that the region, as a whole, was utterly desolate. It was, according to the record, a "waste howling wilderness; a land of deserts and of pits, a land of drought and the shadow of death, a land that no man passed through, and where no man dwelt." Deut. xxxii: 10; Jer. ii: 6. Compare Num. xx: 4, 5; Deut. viii: 15. The Hebrews, having experienced the reluctant hospitalities of the country, were in perpetual terror lest they should perish with hunger and thirst, and repeatedly murmured against Moses and against God who had brought them out into the wilderness to die there. And even Moses, when Jehovah promised to give the people meat for a month, replied incredulously, "Shall the flocks and the herds be slain for them, to suffice them? or shall all the fish of the sea be gathered together for them, to suffice them?" Num. xi: 22.

The foregoing observations indicate the two vital points in the history of Israel in the wilderness. The first brings into view their moral debasement, and raises the inquiry how were they made fit for their calling and destiny? The second takes into account the perils of the wilderness, and raises the inquiry how were the people led safely to the promised land? The history turns, therefore, upon the course of divine grace and the course of divine providence by which the spiritual reformation, and the preservation, day by day, of the chosen seed were effected.

From Rameses, in Egypt, whence the Hebrews took their departure, by the way of the river Arish and the city of Gaza to Hebron, is less than two hundred and fifty miles; a journey which might have been easily made by the Israelites in forty days. Travelers from Cairo to Jaffa usually take with them provisions for twelve days; Napoleon marched his army from Cairo to El Arish, about one hundred and fifty miles, in less than six days. The hostility of the Philistines, who dwelt about Gaza, rendered this route impracticable. This hostility took its rise, perhaps, from a foray, made by the sons of Ephraim during their residence in Egypt, upon Philistia, for the purposes of plunder. 1 Chron. vii: 20-24. For this reason "God led them not through the way of the land of the Philistines, although that was near: for God said, Lest peradventure the people repent when they see war, and they return



to Egypt." Ex. xiii: 17. It was, moreover, the purpose of God to reveal his law to Israel shortly after the exodus, and to that end he had determined to assemble them at Sinai. But even this circuitous route would not, by its measured length, have detained them many months in the wilderness. The journey from Cairo, by the way of Mount Sinai to Jerusalem, may be accomplished, with camels or mules, in less than sixty days, the traveler giving himself ample time to satisfy everywhere his curiosity. It was, however, a part of the divine plan to detain the people, for the purposes of instruction, discipline, and purification, forty years in the wilderness.

The duration of the sojourn was determined by an incident in the disgraceful revolt at Kadeshbarnea. The twelve spies that were sent from that post into the land of Canaan were absent forty days. After hearing the evil report which ten of these spies brought back, the people refused to go up and take possession of the promised land. Jehovah, in his anger, turned the whole congregation back into the wilderness for the period of forty years—one year for every day in which the unfaithful spies searched the land. Num. xiv: 33, 34. Now it is not difficult to ascertain the ends which were answered by this long wandering.

In the first place, time was given for the old wayward race to pass from life, and give place to a new and better generation. Their bondage in Egypt had engendered within them a weak and cowardly spirit. When Pharaoh and his hosts pressed upon their encampment near the Red Sea, they insulted Moses with the cowardly taunt—"Is not this the word that we did tell thee in Egypt, saying, Let us alone, that we may serve the Egyptians; for it had been better for us to serve the Egyptians than that we should die in the wilderness?" Ex. xiv: 12. At Kadesh, when the spies described "the giants, the sons of Anak, which come of the giants" whom they had seen in Canaan, the Hebrews, like a mob of panic-stricken runaways, "lifted up their voice and cried; and the people wept that night." Num. xiv: 1. It would have been impossible for such a rabble of poltroons to move upon Jericho and Ai, to storm the intrenched cities of Canaan, and to take military possession of the country. They were, moreover, idolatrous, ungodly and sensual. At Marah,

because the waters were bitter, they murmured against Moses. In the wilderness of Sin, because they were hungry, they said: "Would God we had died by the hand of the Lord in the land of Egypt, when we sat by the flesh pots, and did eat bread and were full." Ex. xvi: 3. In Rephidim, because they were thirsty, they chided Moses and tempted Jehovah, saying: "Wherefore is this, that thou has brought us up out of Egypt, to kill us, and our children, and our cattle, with thirst?" Ex. xvii: 3. At Sinai, like so many wild Chaldeans, they went "mad upon their idols," and danced to the music of calf-worship. The names given to their camping-grounds, beyond Sinai, perpetuated, at once, their iniquities and sufferings. The fire of the Lord burnt among them for their murmurings, and they called the name of the place Burning; then the children of Israel wept again, and lusted for flesh, and said: Who will give us flesh to eat? and God sent quails into the camp, and the pestilence with the quails, so that they called the place the Graves of Lust. Num. xi: 1-34. Finally, at Kadesh, their ignominy became complete. The problem of this pusillanimous and godless generation admitted of but one solution. That solution was thus expressed by the Almighty: "As for you, your carcasses, they shall fall in this wilderness." Num. xiv: 32. Forty years afforded ample time for the execution of this righteous judgment. Meanwhile, a more resolute and hardy, a more faithful and godly race, came forward in the persons of their children. They escaped the effeminacy of Egypt, and the cowardliness commonly engendered by a state of servitude; they were inured to hardship and self-denial by their life in the desert; they were trained to warlike habits and soldierly discipline by their conflicts in arms with the Bedouins who harassed their march, and so were prepared for the wars of the conquest. Their spiritual discipline was not neglected. Separated, by the deserts and the seas, from the idolatrous Egyptians on the west, and the foul and filthy inhabitants of Canaan on the north; held aloof, also, from the native tribes of the wilderness, by reciprocal animosity, they were alone with Jehovah. They saw all his mighty works. He walked with them in the pillar of cloud, he fed them with manna, and gave them water out of the sweetened fountain or the smitten rock:

his tabernacle was with them, together with his holy priesthood and daily sacrifices; his smiles rewarded their obedience, and his judgments avenged their presumptuous sins. This discipline was complete and effectual. Never, in the history of the world, has a change so radical been wrought upon a people in forty years; never did two successive generations contrast each other more thoroughly than the sons who crossed the Jordan, and the fathers who crossed the Red Sea. Those who left Egypt were, as has been seen, in hopeless apostasy; those who entered Canaan composed, perhaps, one of the purest of all the generations of Israel, from Abraham to Christ. Deut. viii: 2-5; Josh. xxiv: 14-31; Jer. ii: 2, 3.

In the second place, opportunity was afforded in the course of forty years for the education of the Hebrews in the usages of the ceremonial law. The Mosaic institutes were to the Hebrews, considered as a civil commonwealth, a written constitution, a body of common law and the statutes at large—all complete. These institutes embraced also a confession of faith, a directory for worship, a form of government, and a book of discipline for the people, considered as a church; these were also perfect to their end, and the whole is condensed within the smallest possible compass. It is, by far, the most comprehensive and compact, the most thoroughly excogitated and nicely-adjusted code of civil and ecclesiastical law ever produced. The ceremonial law, which is but one member of the general system, is, in itself, both complete and complicated. Complete it is, because it provides fully for the four parts of worship, the sanctuary, the priesthood, the ritual, and the kalender; that is to say, it prescribes the place, the officers, the forms and the times of divine worship. It is complicated, also, as he who has most carefully considered the subject, in all its parts and relations, best knows. Most of those who have gone into the investigation, have failed for lack of ability or patience to master the system. Indeed, the labors of both Rabbinical and Christian scholars, continued through the ages, have not yet produced a satisfactory treatise on the Jewish ceremonial law. The Jewish divines have not duly estimated Christianity, in which the ceremonial law obtained its highest expression, and the Christian divines have not duly considered Judaism in which

Christianity took its beginning. Very few of them have appreciated the profound remark of Augustine: "The New Testament lies hidden in the Old, the Old is laid open in the New." But it was indispensable that the ceremonies of the law, the due order, method, and sequences of its forms of worship, should be thoroughly understood by the Hebrews. These rites were to be established in Palestine as the usages of the country, they were to express for fifteen hundred years the devout affections of the people, to make up the sum of their religious traditions, to enter as vital forces into the very elements of national life, and to be the chosen vessels bearing the treasures of salvation to the ages to come. It was needful, therefore, that the people be subjected to a course of special and thorough education in the law; and the wilderness afforded the conditions of that protracted education. They were alone, dwelling in those awful solitudes for the period of forty years. Fed by manna from heaven, they were relieved from daily labor and had leisure for the studies set before them. Far away from thronged cities, from the bustle of trade and commerce, from the maddening din of long and dreary wars, never agitated by the restless fever of modern western civilization, or even the gentler and more sluggish movements of oriental society, the chosen seed had but a single serious occupation—the study of the law and attendance upon the solemnities of public worship. The tabernacle was always pitched in the center of the encampment; the brazen altar and the law stood in the open sight of the people; and all things were so arranged as to allow the tribes gathered around the court of the tabernacle to witness the daily course of the ceremonial—the service of the priesthood, the ceaseless oblations, the unquenched fire and the smoke of the victims ascending day and night. They had Moses and Aaron, to whom the law was given, as their ministers, ready to expound the sacred mysteries, and Jehovah himself answered out of the cloud to the prayer of Moses and the elders seeking further knowledge of his holy will. It was a grand school of instruction, on subjects most solemn, taught by masters wise beyond their time, because divinely taught themselves and inspired; the instruction addressing the eye through a bloody but magnificent ritual, and the ear first

through the voice that came out of the cloud, which voice they that heard, entreated that it should not be spoken to them any more, and then afterward through the words that God spoke to Moses and Aaron.

Nor, in the third place, were the heathen forgotten in the providential purposes of the wandering. A map of the wilderness, exhibiting the distribution of its native tribes, will show that the hosts of the Lord marched through the pastures of Midian in the desert of Sinai; they sojourned thirty-eight years among the Amalekites of Paran; they moved along the range of mountains occupied by the inhospitable descendants of Esau; they traversed the plains of Moab and Ammon, and laid their course within the borders of the war-faring Ammonites. These tribes saw the wonders in the desert—the daily miracle of the manna from heaven was wrought in their presence, and they beheld from afar the pillar of cloud and of fire. The wandering, in its relations to the Bedouins, presented three aspects. The church of God was carried into the bosom of heathen tribes, as before it went to Egypt and long afterward into Babylon. The hostility which most of these tribes displayed toward Israel, furnished a new illustration of the antipathy of the seed of the serpent against the seed of the woman. And what was of more importance, the pagan world received a profound impression of the majesty of the true God. This result was foreshown in the song of Moses at the Red Sea. "The people shall hear and be afraid: sorrow shall take hold on the inhabitants of Palestine. Then the dukes of Edom shall be amazed; the mighty men of Moab, trembling, shall take hold upon them; all the inhabitants of Canaan shall melt away. Fear and dread shall fall upon them." Ex. xv: 15-17. Jethro afterward blessed Jehovah, who had delivered the Hebrews out of the hands of the Egyptians, adding these words: "Now I know that the Lord is greater than all gods." Ex. xviii: 11. The tidings from the wilderness traversed the desert of Arabia as far as the Euphrates, and extorted from Balaam the confession that "God brought them out of Egypt." Num. xxiii: 22. These tidings went before the Israelites into the land of Canaan, at once exalting the name of Jehovah and preparing the way for an easy conquest of the promised land. To the two spies

Rahab said: "We have heard how the Lord dried up the waters of the Red Sea for you, when you came out of Egypt. \* \* \* And as soon as we heard these things, our hearts did melt, neither did there remain any more courage in any man because of you; for the Lord your God, he is God in heaven above and in earth beneath," Josh. ii: 10, 11. Compare Num. xxii: 3; xxiii: 18-24; Josh. iv: 23, 24; v: 1.

The miracles that were wrought in the wilderness occupy positions of paramount importance in the inspired record. It is not sufficient to say that they were adapted to the urgent necessities of the wandering Hebrews, were wonderful displays of almighty power, and are, in their leading characteristics, peculiar to this part of biblical history. They were more: they were revelations of the only living and true God exactly suited to the state of the church and the world, they were instruments, powers indeed, in the education and discipline of the chosen seed. Several modern scholars, among whom is Canon Stanley in his *History of the Jewish Church*, have fallen short of the truth, egregiously and lamentably by reason of their having overlooked the supreme efficacy of these miracles as the means of spiritual culture to the Hebrew race, and their supreme importance as self-revelations of the Almighty. Any survey of this period, however admirable in other respects, will be wholly insufficient, if it does not reproduce, in their just proportions, the supernatural features of the history. The most remarkable of these wonders were the pillar of cloud and of fire, the passage of the Red Sea, the rain of bread from heaven, the miraculous supply of water, the defeat of Amalek, the judgments on the Hebrews, and the theophany at Sinai.

Soon after the exodus, there appeared in the camp of Israel a pillar of cloud and of fire. This phenomenon assumed the form of a lofty column, its base approaching, perhaps touching, the surface of the earth, its top rising high into the heavens, opaque by day, luminous by night. Possibly the light was diffused through the mass of the cloud, the whole resembling a distant conflagration, or the torch of a volcano. But it is more probable that an inner column of flaming fire was enveloped by an exterior covering of cloud. The critics have determined its dimensions from Ps. cv: 39, in which it



is written that God spread over the Hebrews "a cloud for a covering," as well as "a fire to give light in the night." According to the current interpretation of that expression, compared with Num. x : 34, and Isa. iv : 5, 6 ; the upper part of the cloud expanded like a canopy, protecting the camp of Israel from the burning sun ; and it is further estimated that the camp itself, containing two millions of persons, with their flocks, usually occupied a space of not less than twelve miles square.

The narrative, fairly interpreted, concludes to the proposition that the cloudy pillar was the dwelling place of Jehovah. The record states in so many words that "the LORD went before them by day in a pillar of a cloud, and by night in a pillar of fire;" "the angel of the LORD (the Jehovah angel) which went before the camp of Israel, removed, and went behind them;" and "the glory of Jehovah appeared in a cloud." Ex. xiii : 21 ; xiv : 19 ; xvi : 10. The substance of the pillar, even flaming fire, was an appropriate symbol of the presence of Jehovah, "for our God is a consuming fire." Heb. xii : 29. Moreover, the central burning splendor was veiled from mortal eyes by the enveloping cloud, even as the Almighty "dwelleth in the light which no man can approach unto." 1 Tim. vi : 16. The phenomenon was, therefore, a perpetual vision of God, the culmination of all theophanies of the five hundred years preceding. It followed the wonderful law of progression according to which all the self-revelations of Jehovah have proceeded ; it was a smoking furnace in the vision of Abraham, a burning bush in the presence of Moses, and now a flaming fire, traversing the wilderness, with undimmed majesty, for the space of forty years.

The leading design of the pillar was, undoubtedly, to make manifest, in the midst of the Israelites, the being and glory of Jehovah. Their ignorance of the true God and their proneness to idolatry and polytheism, rendered it necessary that Jehovah should reveal himself to their senses by an open and awful vision ; and that he should demonstrate by his perpetual presence among them that he is a God not afar off but nigh at hand. But in addition to its uses as a revelation of the Almighty, it served many other important purposes. Its movements directed the march of the Israelites. In the place



where the cloud stood still, they pitched their tents; so long as the cloud abode there they rested in their encampments; and when the cloud was taken up, whether by day or by night, they struck their tents, and followed it in all their journeys. Still further, like the shadow of a great rock in a weary land, the Almighty spread the curtains of the cloud over the bleak and burning desert. The holy oracle, too, was established in its bosom. "He spake unto them in the cloudy pillar." Ps. xcix: 7. At the giving of the law, the pillar arose and stood on the summit of Mount Horeb, and Jehovah came down into the midst of it and gave his law to Moses. When the tabernacle was set up, for the first time on the adjacent plain, "the cloudy pillar descended, and stood at the door of the tabernacle, and JEHOVAH talked with Moses." Ex. xxxiii: 9-11. The Almighty appeared again in the cloud to bestow on the seventy elders the spirit of Moses; and as the day drew near on which Moses was to die, the LORD spake with Moses and Joshua from the midst of the cloud. Num. xi: 25; Deut. xxxi: 15.

And that nothing might be wanting to the majesty of this Shekinah, the Almighty set within it his throne of judgment. At the Red Sea, the Divine wrath flashed forth from the bosom of the cloud upon the host of the Egyptians. When Miriam, and at her instigation, Aaron, also, became seditious, God called the malcontents into the bosom of the cloud, and when the cloud departed, "behold, Miriam became leprous, white as snow." Num. xii: 10. Fire went out from the Lord and devoured Nadab and Abihu; and in the rebellion of Korah and his company, a fire came out again and consumed two hundred and fifty of the conspirators. Forty years long, this vision of consummate glory stood in the sight of Israel—at once a revelation and presence-chamber of Jehovah, a guide and canopy by day, a torch and sentinel by night, a holy oracle, and a throne of judgment. When they reached the borders of Canaan, it was taken up out of sight. Throughout the after ages, it was seen but once. At Solomon's temple, in the act of dedication, "the house was filled with a cloud, even the house of the LORD, so that the priests could not stand to minister by reason of the cloud; for the glory of the LORD had filled the house of God." 2 Chron. v: 14.

The rationalists have diligently practiced their arts of critical sorcery on this symbol of the Divine presence. These magicians resolve the glory in which God came down upon Sinai, and in which the Son of Man appeared at the transfiguration, into thunder-storms, and the shining of Moses' face into simple electricity. They see nothing in the first plague but the effects of red clay held in solution by the waters of the Nile, and nothing in the tenth beside a bloody raid of Bedouin Arabs, or a cruel butchery by the hands of the Israelites. According to them, the vision of Zachariah was effected by the smoke of the chandeliers in the temple. The "star which went before the wise men" was a servant bearing a flambeau; and the angels who ministered to Christ, after the temptation, were a caravan of merchants, crossing the desert, laden with provisions. The man restored to sight, by our Saviour, was blinded by dust lodged in his eyes, and cured by washing them in the pool of Siloam. Christ, also, healed the deaf and the dumb by a surgical operation, cleverly performed, while apparently touching the ear or the tongue. And, as for Peter, it is most natural to suppose, considering his assault on Malchus, that he stabbed Ananias and Sapphira with a concealed weapon. These critics have, of course, found but little difficulty in resolving the cloudy pillar into a caravan-fire, such as was used by Alexander in his march across the desert, or into fire-baskets, filled with resinous wood, and carried on long poles at the head of the wandering Hebrews. Toland, the English Deist, gravely conjectures that the pillar was a signal arranged by Hobab, who undertook to guide the march through the wilderness. Stickel is not ashamed to suggest that the signal-fire, which was usually kindled in front of the camp, was, at the Red Sea, by a stratagem of war, transferred to the rear; the result of which was, that the "east-wind," at that moment prevailing, blew the smoke into the faces of the Egyptians, and lighted up the path through the sea before the Israelites; and this is what Moses teaches in Ex. xiv: 19, 20: "the pillar of cloud came between the camp of the Egyptians and the camp of Israel; and it was a cloud and darkness to them, but it gave light by night to these: so that the one came not near the other all the night."

On the departure of the Hebrews from Rameses, Moses

took the route which would have led him around the head of the Red Sea. But as he approached that point, he suddenly turned his course southward, by the command of the Almighty, and encamped the moving hosts of Israel along the western shore of the sea, putting the sea itself between them and the peninsula of Sinai, and putting them between the sea and their enemies. The intelligence went to Pharaoh that they were "entangled in the land." Ex. xiv: 1-4. Whether the king suspected that Moses had been abandoned to a fatal blunder by his God, or had taken leave of his common sense, is not explained. The record makes known the fact that the stratagem was prepared by the Almighty, and that by the stupenduous miracle at the sea, the judgment of God, which had already laid waste the land of Egypt, falling on the elements of nature, on man and beast, on magicians and idols, and on the first-born of all the heathen, was now summarily and finally executed on Pharaoh and on the flower of his army. When they sunk ignominiously into the depths of the sea, the triumph of God's people and the humiliation of his enemies were complete. The head of the serpent was bruised.

Two questions, incidentally connected with the miracle, require some attention. One of these relates to the exact point at which the passage of the sea was effected, and the other to the supernatural agencies called forth by the emergency. Dr. Edward Robinson and Dr. Kurtz are of opinion that the passage took place at a narrow arm of the sea near Suez. Raumer, Father Sicard, Dr. Olin and others, follow the well-settled traditions of that region, according to which the waters were opened at Ras Atakah, twelve miles below Suez, where the sea is about twelve miles wide, and very deep. In this conflict of authorities, in the absence of exact knowledge as to the topography of the country, and, what is more embarrassing, in the irremediable ignorance of mankind respecting the geological changes which have been wrought upon the shores and shoals of the sea in the run of thirty-five hundred years, it is impossible for the inquirer to reach any incontestable conclusion. It ought, however, to be stated that those whose habits of thought incline them to reduce the supernatural in the transaction to its lowest terms, will inva-

riably determine the question in favor of Suez. For, according to Kurtz, the breadth of the sea at that place is now only eleven hundred and seven yards, although, as he remarks, it may have been wider in the time of Moses. According to Professor Robinson, the broad shoals which are found there are still left bare at ebb-tide; the channel is forded by caravans at very low water; and General Bonaparte and his suite attempted the passage in 1799, although they were exposed to the greatest danger. At this point, the avowed rationalists step in and take up the unhappy parable of these orthodox critics. What, in the hands of Professors Kurtz and Robinson, is semi-miraculous, becomes, in the hands of Palfrey and others, no miracle at all or one of the very faintest type. The record, at Ex. xiv: 22, states that the Israelites "went into the midst of the sea upon the dry ground." Palfrey teaches that the Hebrew text means simply "land sufficiently bare of water to walk on." The sea at Suez, according to a fair conclusion from the statements of Kurtz and Robinson, was too narrow and too shallow to receive and drown the hosts of Egypt with their chariots and horses. But the words of Moses are: "There remained not so much as one of them." The explanation of Palfrey is: "We are by no means told that every individual perished. Moses relates what he saw: 'There remained not so much as one of them,' in his view." Still further, if the Hebrews crossed at Suez, why did not the Egyptian cavalry ride swiftly around the head of the sea, only four miles distant, and attack Moses in front as he approached the eastern shore?

In regard to what was supernatural in the transaction, Prof. Robinson's remarks are: "The Lord, it is said, caused the sea to go (or to flow out) by a *strong east wind*. The miracle is therefore represented as mediate; not a direct suspension of, or interference with, the laws of nature, but a miraculous adaptation of those laws to produce a required result. It was wrought by natural means supernaturally applied. For this reason we are entitled to look only for the natural effects arising from the operation of such a cause. In the somewhat indefinite phraseology of the Hebrew, an east wind means any wind from the eastern quarter; and would include the north-east wind, which often prevails in that region. Now it will be

obvious from the inspection of any good map of the gulf, that a strong northeast wind acting here upon the ebb-tide would necessarily have the effect to drive out the waters from the small arm of the sea which runs up by Suez, and also from the end of the gulf itself, leaving the shallow portions dry; while the more northern part of the arm, which was anciently broader and deeper than at present, would still remain covered with water. Thus the waters would be divided, and be a wall (or defense) to the Israelites on the 'right hand and the left.' If, then, as is most probable, the wind thus miraculously sent, acted upon the ebb-tide to drive out the waters during the night to a far greater extent than usual, we still can not assume that the extraordinary ebb, thus brought about by natural means, would continue more than three or four hours at most." Thus far Dr. Robinson. It would be doing great injustice to this eminent scholar—and such injustice were inexcusable now that death has closed his pious labors—to overlook the distinctness with which he affirms the presence of the supernatural, to a certain important extent. But his exalted reputation as a biblical scholar makes it the more necessary that the exceptions to which his opinions are liable, should be distinctly pointed out. To some of these exceptions, taken singly, more weight is to be attached than to others; but their cumulative effect is entitled to consideration. Dr. R. assumes that the sea was opened at Suez, a statement which is vital to his argument; but Moses does not determine that question, and the traditions of the region and some of the best authorities, ancient and modern, designate Ras Atakah as the place of transit. According to the record the wind blew strongly from the east; Dr. R. assumes that it came out of the north-east. The record is silent as to the state of the tide; Dr. R. assumes that the wind was assisted by the ebb-tide. The record contains no intimation as to the portion of the night occupied by the Hebrews in the passage of the sea; Dr. R. assumes that they crossed the sea in four hours, the interval between the ebb and flow of the tide. Lastly, the record states, in terms, that the "waters were a wall on the right hand and the left" and the "floods stood upright as an heap;" Dr. R. assumes that the deeper waters on either side of the shoals were simply "a defense" to the flanks of the Hebrews; that is to say, the

waters, instead of "standing upright as an heap," were in fact blown down by the wind to a lower level than usual. These are not deductions from the word of God; they are assumptions, for the most part gratuitous and even violent, and as such are wholly inadmissible in an argument the effect of which is to exhaust the miracles by which Jehovah honored himself on Pharaoh and all his host.

The sacred writers deal with the subject in a far different spirit. One and all of them treat the cleaving of the sea as a most wonderful display of omnipotence, a stupendous miracle, the appropriate termination of a series of amazing and terrific manifestations of the Almighty. Moses and the children of Israel, in their song of triumph, use language which exceeds the bounds of even poetical license, if it be taken as descriptive of nothing more than an ebb-tide, an easterly wind, and the retreat of the shallow waters from the shoals. They sing: "Who is like unto thee, O LORD, among the gods? Who is like thee, glorious in holiness, fearful in praises, doing wonders?" Ex. xv: 4-12. Joshua describes the parting of the Jordan and of the sea as miracles of the same kind. "For the Lord your God dried up the waters of Jordan from before you, until ye were passed over, as the Lord your God did to the Red Sea, which he dried up before us until we were gone over." Josh. iv: 23. It is not pretended that there were either shoals or an ebb-tide at the Jordan. David and Asaph treat the event as one of the "terrible doings" of God; they celebrate the "strength by which He divided the sea; and the "rebuke" by which he dried up the waters. Ps. lxxvi: 5, lxxiv: 13, lxxviii: 13, cvi: 9, cxxxvi: 13. Isaiah refers the wonder to the "glorious arm" of Jehovah; and Nehemiah ascribes it no less distinctly to His power. Is. lxxiii: 12; Neh. ix: 11. One of two conclusions lies very near the speculations of Professors Robinson and Kurtz: Either the word of God grossly exaggerates the facts, or these critics have well-nigh stripped them of their real significance. Nothing is gained by attempts at conciliating the spirit of destructive criticism. When an evangelical divine puts the miracle at the Red Sea on the basis of natural law, the naturalist improves the advantage and reduces the event to the ordinary competency of wind and tide; then the critic of the school of Bauer resolves



the little that is left into a myth and assigns the Pentateuch and the destruction of Pharaoh to a place in legendary literature side by side with the *Æneid* and the drowning of Palinurus. The battle is often lost by an abandonment of the outposts.

"They struggle vainly to preserve a part  
Who have not courage to contend for all."

Another miracle of the wilderness was the appearance of the manna. Ex. xvi: 4-26. Num. xi: 7, 8. The critics who reject the church doctrine of plenary inspiration and of the supernatural, have found this part of the narrative peculiarly unmanageable. Canon Stanley, an adept in the critical arts of the Broad church party, dismisses the subject with a few vague remarks and some pretty lines from Keble's "Song of the manna-gatherers." This attempt to shift the subject from the region of history to that of poetry, may please the fancy, but will hardly satisfy the love of truth. Here are two millions of people, of whom fourteen hundred thousand are old men, women, and children, with cattle estimated at two millions; they strike out boldly into the interior of Arabia Petrea; they wander in the deserts forty years. Now, how were they fed?—that is the question. Those who are familiar with the movements of modern armies can appreciate the difficulties of the problem. When a few thousand men are to be landed on the enemy's coast, in addition to the ships employed to convey the troops, the wide sea is almost covered with transports bearing the *materiel* of war. In the month of September, 1862, General Buell moved the Federal army of about fifty thousand men, from Huntsville to Louisville. The region through which he passed is, as a whole, very productive, yet his wagon train was said, at the time, to be twenty miles long. General Lee recently marched into Pennsylvania at the head of a Confederate army, estimated at from seventy-five to one hundred and twenty thousand men; his train, according to the newspapers, contained several thousand wagons. Now if these campaigns, of from fifty to one hundred and twenty thousand men, conducted in fertile regions and finished in thirty days, be compared with the movement of two millions of people, along a burning waste, and continued through forty



years; or if the melancholy history of Napoleon's march of six days, with only ten thousand men, from Cairo to El Arish, be considered in its bearings on the case, a problem emerges which Mr. Stanley will scarcely solve by poetical numbers, however smoothly they may flow. This sojourn in the wilderness is to be accounted for, and rationalism gains nothing by denying or quietly ignoring the miracle of the manna, while it leaves the facts unexplained.

Some of the German critics have put a bold face upon the matter, and denied out and out that the Hebrews crossed the desert. But whence came those indelible traces of the wandering which are left upon the whole body of Hebrew tradition and literature? Even Ewald, one of the boldest rationalists of his generation, holds that the truth of the journey must be admitted, or the truth of the after-history denied. Hitzig meets the difficulty by reducing the forty years to four; and Van Bohlen amends Hitzig's proposition by striking out four and inserting two. But how was the vast and helpless throng sustained even two years in the desert? Colenso, by different applications of his elastic rule-of-three, reduces the numbers of the Israelites first to fifty-seven, then to sixteen, and finally to eight thousand. Laborde brings the six hundred thousand down to six hundred armed men. Stanley leaves the question to "the critical analysis of the text and the probabilities of the case." But how was it possible for a few thousand slaves to escape from Egypt and achieve the conquest of Canaan? Others still weakly suggest that the natural manna of the desert, the production of the tarfa shrub, supplied the people with food. But, according to Burkhardt, the quantity of manna collected in a single year, over the whole peninsula, does not exceed six hundred pounds; and, according to Kurtz, the tarfa shrub is not found in the part of the desert where the people were detained for thirty-eight years. And, furthermore, the true manna fell upon the ground as well as upon the plants; that which remained ungathered dissolved in the heat of the sun; if kept beyond one day it became corrupt; a double quantity fell on the sixth day; none fell on the seventh; that which was gathered on the sixth remained sweet and wholesome through the seventh day; and a portion laid up in the ark of the cov-

enant remained undecayed for ages. If the inquiry be determined by the record, it is impossible to torture the element of the supernatural out of the transaction. If it be determined by the nature of the case, it is certain, that the journey could not have been made, unless the Almighty had fed the people by an open miracle. If the miracle be denied, then the sojourn of two millions of people forty years in the desert, must be denied out and out, or, as an alternative, reduced to the rapid march of a small caravan of Hebrews from Egypt to Canaan. The effect of this mode of criticism will be to dwarf the whole history, before and after, into insignificant proportions. For, if only a few hundred Israelites emigrated from Egypt, then their long sojourn and numerical increase in that land, their enslavement, the ten wonders wrought for their emancipation, and the dividing of the Red Sea, can be nothing more than pleasant but feeble legends; the pillar of fire shrinks into the dimensions of a bonfire; the theophany of Sinai subsides into a thunder-storm, and the passage of the Jordan and the conquest of Canaan, take their places in the chronicles of romance. It is only when the history, as it is written in the Pentateuch, is accepted as veritable history, its unities all observed, and its philosophy truly expounded, that the whole assumes its proper proportions and due relations. Then it is seen that the miracle of the manna supplied at once the physical and spiritual wants of the people; and it fed them day by day, and it made known day by day the supremacy, the eternal power and God-head of Jehovah. In like manner the miracle of the loaves and fishes fed the hungry and revealed the Son of God.

The scarcity of water in the wilderness called for repeated instances of the divine interposition. There were springs of water along the course of the journey, and wells were occasionally digged. But at one of the stations the water was bitter, and was miraculously sweetened. Subsequently the rock on the side of Horeb, smitten by the rod of Moses, and again, in the last year of the wandering, the rock at Kadesh gave forth water abundantly for the congregation and their herds. The memory of these miracles outlived many generations, and found expression in the psalmody of David and the prophecy of Isaiah. The song of David is, "He opened the rock, and the waters gushed out; they ran in dry places like

a river." Ps. cv: 41. The words of Isaiah are: "They thirsted not when he led them through the deserts: he caused the waters to flow out of the rock for them; he clave the rock also, and the waters gushed out." Is. xlviii: 21. And yet Lipsius can see nothing in the gushing rock besides "the sparkling and pleasant fountain of Wady Feiran;" and critics there are who make good their escape from the testimony of Moses, David, and Isaiah in the whimsical story of Tacitus, to the effect that the Jews, on their escape from Egypt, were thoroughly exhausted for the want of water; Moses, however, observed a herd of wild asses climbing to the top of a rock covered with trees; he followed them, and found a well with a copious supply of water; this led him to set up the image of an ass to be worshiped in the holy place.

Not less decisive was the interposition of Jehovah when the Amalekites attacked the Hebrews at Rephidim. This onslaught took its alarming proportions not only from the numbers and boldness of the Bedonins, but from the fact that they fell upon the exhausted and unprotected rear of the Israelites. "Remember what Amalek did unto thee by the way, when ye were come forth out of Egypt; how he did meet thee by the way and smote the hindmost of thee, even all that were feeble behind thee, when thou wast faint and weary; and he feared not God." Deut. xxv: 17, 18. The scattered condition of the armed forces of Israel, together with the atheism of the heathen, rendered it needful that Jehovah should himself appear upon the field. Moses ordered Joshua to lead a column of picked men against the enemy, while he himself took his rod and went up to the top of a hill with Aaron and Hur. Ex. xvii: 8-16. According to the well-settled opinion of the church, the hands of Moses were lifted up in the act of intercession; and the incident is one of the most signal examples in the Old Testament of the power of prayer, falling as such into the same class with the wrestling of Jacob, the face of Elijah bowed between his knees on Carmel, the tears of Hezekiah, and the supplications of Daniel. But the rationalists have taught that Moses did nothing more than hold up his well-known staff as a battle-standard for the purpose of inspiring his forces with courage and hope. Kurtz agrees with these critics in the opinion that the attitude of

Moses was not that of prayer; but he adds, that the display of the staff, by which so many miracles had been wrought, was a signal from Jehovah to Israel, assuring them of his presence and of their certain triumph. Calvin, with his usual discernment, suggests that God had chosen Moses "as intercessor to conquer the enemies from afar, by the stretching forth of his rod, and by his secret earnestness in prayer."

On several occasions, moreover, God inflicted chastisements upon the people, after methods strictly supernatural. At Taberah, the fire of the Lord burnt among them; at the Graves of Lust, the plague raged in the camp; at Hazeroth, Miriam was smitten with leprosy; shortly afterward, the earth opened and swallowed up Korah and his company, fire from the Lord consumed two hundred and fifty of the conspirators, and a plague destroyed several thousands of their partisans; in the fortieth year of the wandering, the Lord scourged them with fiery serpents; and finally, on the plains of Moab, twenty thousand perished by the pestilence, in punishment for idolatry and whoredom. These were not ordinary visitations of God, for the property of the supernatural is discoverable in them all; either in the judgment itself, as in the fire that came out from the Lord and consumed the guilty, or in the relief afforded, as when the plague was stayed by the burning censer of Aaron, or in both the nature of the calamity and the mode of escape, as in the fiery serpent and the brazen serpent. They were, not less palpably than the pillar of cloud, direct interpositions of Jehovah, revelations of his authority, and instruments in the spiritual discipline of the Israelites.

The most remarkable of all these discoveries of the Almighty was made in the awful theophany of Sinai, at the giving of the law. It is not proposed to spread upon these pages the details of this transaction. No exposition of the record can throw new light upon the great events themselves, nor give effect to its own simple but sublime descriptions of the scene. Nor is it needful to waste breath upon the preposterous efforts of the naturalists to explain the facts by the phenomena of nature and the laws of legendary composition. The scene itself made impressions so vivid and enduring upon the Hebrew mind, that it passed down, as a living power, to all the generations, creating and shaping the sentiments and

emotions, the passions also of the race. The psalmists, the early and later prophets, took impressions from Sinai scarcely less vivid than the men who were terrified by the open and awful vision and voice of Jehovah. The law itself, and the sensible manifestations of Jehovah's presence from out which it was given, were wonderful revelations of the only living and true God.

On a review of the wonders wrought in the wilderness it may be said, first, that they were precisely adapted to the immediate exigencies of the people. The interposition at the Red Sea delivered them from the vengeance of Pharaoh; the cloudy pillar led them safely along their intricate and perilous way; manna from heaven fed them; water from the smitten rock refreshed them; the prayer of Moses and his uplifted rod defeated the Amalekites; the rebukes of the Almighty corrected the people for their iniquities; and the vision of Sinai awed them into submission to one of the most onerous and inflexible systems of government and worship ever imposed on any nation. These wonders, like the miracles of Christ, and indeed like all the miracles of the Bible, were, not one of them, intended for mere effect; none was simply a discovery of God's presence and power; but every one was answerable to some grave emergency in the history of the chosen seed. Secondly, their variety is worthy of notice. God did not, he never does, repeat himself. The boundless resources of omnipotent power were used to accomplish the purposes of infinite wisdom. Effects thoroughly opposite to each other were produced. The same pillar of cloud was darkness to the Egyptians and gave light to the Hebrews. Fiery serpents bit the people, and the bitten were healed by looking at the serpent of brass. At one time the Almighty piled up the waves of the Red Sea into a wall, like solid masonry, and at another he "turned the flint into a fountain of waters." Ex. xv: 8; Ps. cxiv: 8.

When Egypt's king God's chosen tribe pursued,  
In crystal walls the admiring waters stood;  
When through the desert wild they took their way,  
The rocks relented and poured forth a sea:  
What limit can Almighty goodness know  
When seas can harden and when rocks can flow?

[Unknown.]

Thirdly, some of these miracles were continuous. The other wonders, both of the Old and New Testaments, terminated, for the most part, in a single act of power. The mighty works of Christ, even the greatest of them all, his resurrection from the dead, were begun and finished in a moment. But the manna fell in the wilderness six days out of seven, and the pillar of cloud and fire abode day and night with the camp through the period of forty years. Finally, these works were an important part of the teaching and discipline by which the Hebrews were trained for their calling and destiny as the church of God. They brought home to the people the primary lesson of the being, unity and supremacy of Jehovah, the supplementary lesson that he is a God not afar off but nigh at hand; the further truth that Judaism was the only true religion, the only way of salvation, and the final truth that Israel was the Church of God, and as such was at once the object of his infinite mercies and of his sore rebukes, holding the word of grace in sacred trust for the whole race of human kind. Moses summed it all up in these words: "And thou shalt remember all the way which the Lord thy God led thee these forty years in the wilderness, to humble thee, and to prove thee, to know what was in thine heart, whether thou wouldest keep his commandments or no. And he humbled thee, and suffered thee to hunger and fed thee with manna, which thou knewest not, neither did thy fathers know; that he might make thee know that man doth not live by bread only, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of the Lord doth man live. Thy raiment waxed not old upon thee, neither did thy foot swell, these forty years. Thou shalt also consider in thine heart, that as a man chasteneth his son, so the Lord thy God chasteneth thee." Deut. viii: 2-5.

The general design of this part of biblical history has now been pointed out. It was intended to show how the Almighty, working in a supernatural way, accomplished a twofold purpose: the transfer of the hosts of Israel from Egypt to Canaan, and their spiritual renovation. This plan undoubtedly regulated the composition of the narrative. But the record sets forth some other truths, which, though subordinate to its main design, ought not to be overlooked. It is



so constructed, in the first place, as to humble both the inordinate pride and inordinate self-righteousness of the Jews. The pride of a distinguished ancestry, a sentiment common to mankind, amounted almost to a hateful passion in the bosom of the Jew. The character and position of their patriarchs was a title to distinction and an excuse for superciliousness which were supposed to be indisputable. Their self-righteousness also amounted almost to a disease. They ascribed the act of God, by which they had become the chosen seed, to their own merits. They were blessed above every other people simply because they were better than any other people. They expressed their charity toward the Gentile in the taunt, "Stand by, for I am holier than thou;" they expressed their humility before God in the prayer, "God, I thank thee that I am not as other men are." Now, in the Book of Genesis Moses shows that Abraham's kindred, and probably Abraham himself, in early life were idolators. He records, also with judicial impartiality, the inexcusable sins of Abraham after his divine call, the sins of the other pilgrim fathers, of the twelve patriarchs, and of their descendants in Egypt. In the Books of Exodus, Numbers, and Deuteronomy, Moses describes minutely the disobedience, idolatry, cowardice, lust, and whoredoms of the people in the wilderness. He relates also with historical justice, the sins of the men and women in the leading and influential families; the weakness of Aaron in the matter of the golden calf, and the childish jealousy of Miriam in the matter of Moses' wife, by which she was led to contrive a conspiracy against her brother. Nor does Moses, the historian, spare Moses, the transgressor; for he relates, with perfect simplicity, the acts of distrust and arrogance, in punishment of which both Aaron and himself were shut out of Canaan. Num. xx: 12. The genealogy of Korah, Dathan and Abiram, is carefully traced back to Levi and Reuben; this being done, Moses gives an account of the plot into which they entered "with two hundred and fifty princes of the assembly, famous in the congregation, men of renown," and he proceeds to expose their treason and sacrilege, and to relate their condign punishment. He does not conceal the whoredom of the people in Moab, nor the pestilence which swept off twenty-four thousand of the guilty men, nor the



sentence of the Almighty ordering the "heads of the people," that is to say, the princes, if the passage is to be taken in its obvious sense, "to be hanged up before the LORD against the sun." Num. xxv: 4. Indeed, Moses went still further than even this: he was careful to preserve the names of the spies who were sent to search the land of Canaan, and who brought back a lying and cowardly report. These were "heads of the children of Israel," one from each tribe. And, in the after ages, multitudes of the Jews were compelled, by the evidence of their genealogical tables, to recognize, as their direct ancestors, these dishonored men. Could any blows more telling be planted in the very front of a flushed and arrogant national pride? could any argument be more complete and cogent against the pretension that the Jews, as a nation, had obtained their exalted position as a reward of their exalted virtues?

The record is so constructed, in the second place, as to disclose the reasons why God, for about forty years, suffered the manners of the Hebrews in the wilderness. It is a fair question, why did God so long endure the lawlessness and insolence of these people? why did he not exterminate them, or cast them out among the heathen, and raise up from some other race a better seed? One answer to these questions is to be recognized in the general long suffering and patience of God toward the apostate family of man. Num. xiv: 18. Another reply is exhibited in the covenant made with Abraham, and renewed, from time to time, through the period of four hundred years, wherein the Almighty had sworn to bring this very people into the land of Canaan. Truly, Jehovah is a covenant-keeping God! A third reason for this forbearance is disclosed in the memorable interview between Jehovah and Moses, reported in the fourteenth chapter of Numbers. The Almighty, wearied out at last with the indignities put upon him by the Israelites, said to Moses: "I will smite them with the pestilence, and disinherit them, and will make of thee a greater nation, and mightier than they." The reply of Moses was, perhaps, the noblest act of his life. Modestly and reverently he put the offered glory away from himself and his family, the consummate glory which crowns the ancestral head of a mighty nation, and besought the Lord,

for the honor of his own blessed name, not to destroy the people. The Egyptians, he said, and all the heathen that have heard the fame of Jehovah will speak, saying: "Because the Lord was not able to bring this people into the land which he swore unto them, therefore he hath slain them in the wilderness." The prayer of Moses and its great argument prevailed; and God said: "I have pardoned according to thy word." The results of this intercession were remarkable. God sentenced the adult generation to die in the wilderness, and promised anew to bring their children into Canaan, and so he kept his covenant, and upheld the honor of his name. As for Moses, who declined, under the impulses of piety and patriotism, to accept the imperial gift, he died, also, in the wilderness; and his family lingered in obscurity until David conferred some slight distinction upon a portion of his descendants. 1 Chron. xxvi: 25-28. Compare Judges xviii: 30. Jehovah explained it all by the pen of Ezekiel. "I wrought for my name's sake, that it should not be polluted before the heathen, in whose sight I brought them out." Ezek. xx: 9-26. But God intended to use the Hebrew race as the channel of mercy to the whole world; and this may be received as the fourth reason for his forbearance toward them in the wilderness. The Jewish bigot was grievously at fault, who held that the immeasurable blessings of the old covenant were intended to terminate on his own perverse but favored nation. The Gentile scoffer is egregiously at fault when he rejects the divine origin of the old covenant on the pretext that its immeasurable blessings were, in fact, exhausted on a single race, few in numbers, narrow in their institutions, usages, and habits of mind, and hedged in between the Mediterranean and the Jordan. The primal organic law of that covenant, as repeatedly stated by the Almighty to each of the older patriarchs, was: "In thee and in thy seed shall all the families of the earth be blessed." Originally chosen were they, multiplied in Egypt, delivered from thralldom there, and preserved amid the perils of the wilderness; to them pertained the adoption, and the glory, and the covenants, and the giving of the law, and the service of God, and the promises, whose were the fathers, and of whom, as concerning the flesh, Christ came, who is over all, God blessed forever. But all these

things were done unto them that through them the Gentiles might be saved.

The record is so constructed, in the third place, as to exhibit in the history of the wandering, types of gospel truths and blessings. It would not be possible, without introducing a superfluous topic, to discuss here the general doctrine of typology. One of the rules adopted by the more rigid schools of interpretation is to the effect, that nothing in the Old Testament is to be accepted as strictly typical which is not either declared or assumed to be typical by the Scriptures themselves. Even under this rule, it will be found, that many of the blessings bestowed on Israel in the wilderness, are set to represent the better things of the gospel. Moses and Joshua are plainly declared to be types of Christ. Deut. xviii : 15 ; Zech. iii : 8. The lifting-up of the brazen serpent represented the lifting-up of Christ as the Saviour of the world. John iii : 14. The passage of the sea foreshadowed baptism, whereby the redeemed became disciples of the Lord. 1 Cor. x : 2. The typical character of the manna is pointed out by Christ himself. John vi : 31-59. The older typologists pressed the subject into fanciful analogies. Witsius, for example, teaches that the minute form of the manna was divinely appointed to set forth the truth that Christ was without form or comeliness, its whiteness corresponded to his purity, its sweetness to the delights which he imparts to believers, and the process of grinding, heating, and baking the manna represented the sufferings by which he became "sweet and wholesome food to our souls." All this may be discarded, and the manna be understood as typical simply of that living bread which came down from heaven, in the person and work of Christ. The smitten rock belongs to the same category. "They drank of that spiritual rock that followed them, and that rock was Christ." 1 Cor. x : 4. According to a Jewish tradition, the rock smitten by Moses actually left its place in Horeb, and rolled along behind the Israelites in their wandering. Some Christian writers teach that, not the rock itself, but its waters flowed after the people in their journey. But the better interpretation is, that Christ himself, the true rock, as the Jehovah-Angel, the God-Revealed, attended the Hebrews in the wilderness and supplied their wants ; he was the

perpetual fountain from which they obtained all needed blessings. According to this explanation, the smitten rock was the type, Christ the rock of living waters, was the antitype; the rock was the spiritual, that is to say, the supernatural source of the stream at Horeb; so he is evermore the redundant fountain of blessings to his disciples; just as he is the vine, the bread of life; just as he is, also, the flesh and the blood, whereof "if a man eat and drink he shall never hunger nor thirst."

Lastly, the narrative presents instructive analogies between the temptations in the wilderness and those experienced by the Son of God. These parallels are not to be insisted on as a part of the essential meaning of the text, but as reflections which are naturally suggested by the history. Now, the temptations in the wilderness were of two kinds. The Israelites tempted God, and were themselves tempted. To tempt God is not merely to try his patience; it is the more presumptuous sin which men commit when they require the Almighty to prove his omnipotence by some instant and open display of his power. Soon after the exodus "the people did chide with Moses and said, 'give us water that we may drink.'" Ex. xvii: 2. The tone of the complaint was offensive to God, therefore the place was called Meribah or Provocation. It was also called Massah, "because they tempted the LORD, saying, 'is the LORD among us or not?'" verse 7. The substance of their saying was, "we will not receive Jehovah as the true God, unless he shall instantly prove himself to be divine. Let him give us water in this waterless desert, and give it at once, and by an open miracle, and then we will believe him." This impious expression of doubt, this insolent challenge of the Almighty, was the precise form of sin by which they tempted God. In this sense the word temptation is used in Ps. xcv: 8; and in Heb. iii: 8, 9. The literal rendering of the Hebrew text is, "harden not your heart like Meribah (Provocation), like the day of Massah (Temptation), in the wilderness." Compare Deut. vi: 16. Nor was this a sudden or transient impiety; for God said, "they have tempted me now these ten times." Num. xiv: 22. Christ, in his turn, experienced this specific form of temptation. The Pharisees "came forth and began to question with Christ, seeking of him a sign from heaven, tempting him." Mark viii: 11. These men

intended to put him to the test. They required him to prove what had been already made manifest. It was a profane and reviling challenge, and was treated as such by the Master.

The other form of temptation was experienced by the Hebrews themselves. The sins into which they were seduced may be distributed somewhat roughly into three classes: the sins of inordinate appetite and passion, as in their clamor for flesh at the Graves of Lust and their whoredoms in Moab, the sin of idolatry at Sinai, and the sin of unbelief at Kadesh-barnea. In like manner Christ was tempted of the devil. The analogies are significant. Israel, in the lower sense, was God's son, his first-born, even as Christ, in the highest sense, was the only begotten of the Father, the Son of God indeed. Both were in the wilderness when they were tempted. Israel was tempted forty years, Christ forty days. The temptations which happened to both were threefold; to Israel, inordinate desire, idolatry, unbelief; to Christ unbelief, presumption, idolatry. Both were assailed by importunate hunger, and both were tempted to the most desperate of all acts of impiety, idolatry. And, as if to complete and to vindicate at once the soundness of the analogy, the evangelists show that in repelling the tempter Christ repeated passages of Scripture, every one of which is taken from the narrative of the wandering. The remarkable fact, therefore, is that Christ experienced temptation in both its kinds. The audacity of the Hebrews in tempting God was imitated by the Pharisees in their interview with Christ; and he was also tempted of the devil.

---

#### ART. IV.—*A Practical Discourse on Christian Beneficence: the Bible Argument.*

THREE principal divine institutions have been given for the government and training of mankind; the family, the church, and the state. Each of them derives its right of existence, and all of its authority, from God. Each of them has been

assigned, by its Divine Author, to a separate and peculiar field of operation. One specific and important department of man's relations has been committed to each of them; and all of them acting, each in its own sphere, but co-operating harmoniously together, embrace, and provide for, the whole of man's temporal and spiritual interests. In their combined action, they fully meet all man's necessities, and supply all his wants. From each, man derives peculiar blessings, which the others can not give; to each, he owes peculiar duties, which he does not owe to the others. And yet it is manifest that the existence and field of operation of these divine institutions, are so intimately connected, that the condition and circumstances of the one mutually affect those of the others. Operating in their appropriate fields, they were intended reciprocally to aid and support each other. Cicero has beautifully said, "The family is the seminary of the state." It is, to a greater extent, the nursery of the church. When the purity of the family is corrupted, and its sacredness disregarded, both the church and the state suffer in their dearest interests. If the church become corrupt, and lose her power over the minds of men, the state soon feels the effect, in the increase of crime and disorder among its citizens. If the state fail to accomplish its divine mission, and allow crime and disorder to prevail among the people, the church immediately suffers in the decline of piety, and the neglect of duty, of her membership. At times like the present, the people of God, who owe duties both to the church and the state, in yielding to the greater demands of the state, are prone to neglect their duties to the church. At such times, the state demands an undue proportion of our time and labors and substance; which our consciences readily construe into a good excuse for disregarding our obligations to the church. There is no part of duty which Christians are more easily induced to omit, than that which forms the substance of this discourse. No grace is more feebly developed in most Christians; none whose exercise is more easily obstructed than Christian beneficence. It is always, therefore, with great difficulty, that the ordinary benevolent operations of the church can be carried on in a time of trouble like that which now exists in our country. Those who are benevolent from principle are compelled to give more liberally



to make up the deficiency of others. Constant efforts have to be made by pastors and agents, by preaching and by writing, to prevent many members from falling sadly below their duty. No efforts, aimed at counteracting this downward tendency, are more likely to prove efficacious than the plain exposition of the teaching of the word of God on this subject. All true and permanent motives for the discharge of Christian duty, must be drawn from the word of God. It must be very gratifying to all lovers of the Lord's cause, that all our benevolent operations have suffered so little during this civil strife. And yet, it has required very great exertion, on the part of the managers of our various benevolent operations, and their friends, to prevent the appearance of much larger deficits in their balance sheets. Since the field for every benevolent operation is continually enlarging, and since the war itself is every day presenting new objects for Christian labors, and since the ability of many is very much weakened, it is manifest that still greater efforts must be made in the future to sustain all our beneficent labors, even at their present standard. It is exactly in this view, therefore, that we have undertaken to present to the consciences of God's people, a plain and simple statement of the teaching of the Scriptures, on the subject of Christian beneficence. Our only design is to set forth, as clearly as we may, the teaching of God's word on this important part of Christian duty. And because our aim is purely a practical one, we propose to address ourselves directly to the enlightened conscience of our Christian readers; and to exclude from this article everything that does not conduce to such an end. No original discussion of the subject is attempted; only a plain presentation of the well-known scriptural argument is offered. And it is addressed, not to critical eyes, but to the hearts of the Lord's earnest and sincere people, who desire to know their duty, that they may do it. What we have to say on the whole subject is very naturally divided into two parts; the first part explaining the system of beneficence taught in the Scriptures; the second part setting forth the motives to beneficence, which the Bible addresses to Christians.



## PART FIRST.

I. "The chief end of man is to glorify God, and to enjoy him forever." The final cause of man's creation was the glory of God. He was so created as to find his highest happiness nowhere but in God. The obligation to glorify God rests on all men alike, whether they have acknowledged or refused to acknowledge the obligation.

But, when a man has been brought to a sincere belief that the Son of God laid down his life for his soul; when he has obtained a strong hope, that he has passed from death unto life; when he feels the peace of God in his soul; when he has proclaimed his sense of duty to glorify his Redeemer by uniting with the visible church; the first question that such a man would ask, is "Lord, what wilt thou have me to do?" Under a deep sense of gratitude, he makes a solemn and final consecration of himself, soul and body, of his time and talents, of his property and influence, to his Divine Redeemer. This consecration is real; and the professor of religion who has not made it, has not really accepted of Christ, nor truly given his heart to him. The want of completeness in their consecration of themselves and all they have to God, is the secret of much of that uneasiness and disquietude, which prevent even many true Christians from enjoying full peace of mind. Their surrender was never unconditional.

Suppose, now, a sincere Christian having, for the first time, made such a consecration of himself to God, and having already offered his children to the Lord in baptism, under the influence of his first love to his Saviour, to open his Bible for the purpose of learning his duty to the world, to the church, and to his God. He must feel that he is bound, by every consideration of duty and gratitude, to use all his substance, to engage in business, and to do all that he does in life, for the single purpose of honoring the Lord that bought him. In this serious perusal of the word of God, one of the points of most diligent inquiry will be what the Bible teaches as to the use to be made of his property. He opens and reads:

1. That God is the original source of all wealth. The Scriptures teach the sublime truth that God made all things out of nothing. Upon this firmest of all foundations, the

divine word rests the whole fabric of God's ownership of the world. "The earth belongs to Jehovah, and the fullness thereof, the world and all they that dwell therein." "Every beast of the forest is mine, and the cattle upon a thousand hills." "The silver is mine, and the gold." The Christian joyfully recognizes his Creator's absolute ownership of all the works of his hands, and exclaims, "Thine, O Lord, is the greatness, and the power, and the glory; for all that is in the heavens and in the earth is thine."

2. He reads further, that the Divine Ruler disposes of all this wealth to men, in his sovereign pleasure, to be employed by them only for his own glory. The true foundation of man's right to the earth, or any of its blessings, is in God's gift of it to man, in Eden. But man has always mistaken the nature of his title to the world. He is only a tenant, holding at the will of the great Proprietor, a dresser of the vineyard, not its owner, a steward managing his Lord's possessions in his absence.

But the Divine Husbandman also distributes his possessions in the exercise of his sovereign pleasure. To one steward He gives one talent, to another two, to a third ten. By the parable of the talents, the Saviour teaches that the Divine Father, in his sovereign wisdom, has given to all his children, according to their several abilities; that each one will be called to account for every talent however small; that even the decisions of the judgment day are made to depend upon our fidelity, or the want of it, in improving the talents committed to us. "And cast ye the unprofitable servant into outer darkness: there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth." The parable of the Unjust Steward teaches, among other things, that he was displaced for squandering his Lord's money on himself.

No true Christian will be disposed to reply to this argument, by saying, "I make my wealth by my labor and economy; or that God has ordained certain fixed laws, obedience to which naturally results in wealth." For, who gives the health and strength to obey these laws? Does not God send his rain upon the just and the unjust? Do you not toil in vain when the earth is parched? Does he not hold the winds in his fists, and sometimes send them abroad to sweep man's proudest

structures from the earth? Does he not hold the waters in the hollow of his hand, and often send the raging flood to destroy the homes and wealth of whole districts? The idea that man can gather wealth, independently of God's favor, is preposterous. If it were true, there would be few poor in the earth.

No candid and intelligent Christian can continue this examination throughout the Scriptures, without coming to the conclusion that all his worldly possessions are the gift of God, intrusted to him for the purpose of promoting his Saviour's glory. He will, therefore, solemnly dedicate all his possessions to God, or, more correctly, he will acknowledge that they already belong to him. And he will be careful to avoid the common mistake of trying to compromise with his Maker, by dedicating a portion to him, and considering the remainder as his own, to be used for his own pleasure.

II. Suppose such an inquiring Christian, with this impression on his mind, that he must use all his possessions for the glory of God, to resume his examination of the Scriptures on this interesting subject, and to turn to the sixteenth chapter of Paul's first letter to the Corinthians, and there read: "Now concerning the collection for the saints, as I have given order to the churches of Galatia, even so do ye. Upon the first day of the week let every one of you lay by him in store, as God hath prospered him, that there be no gatherings when I come." Let us briefly record some of the valuable lessons which this instructive passage would teach him.

1. He could not fail to perceive that this passage does not contain mere advice, but an authoritative command: "*As I have given order to the churches of Galatia, so do ye.*" It was given by an inspired apostle in a solemn formal manner.

It rests on the same authority as any other part of the word of God. It commands a particular duty, and urges compliance in a specific manner. This command was not local and temporary in its application. Paul had already given the same order to the churches of Galatia, whose circumstances were quite different. The epistle is addressed "to all that, in every place, call upon the name of Jesus Christ." It is the constant habit of the Divine Spirit to give instructions for the whole church under special cases. Instructions are given, in

this epistle, on a special case of church discipline, respecting a particular question about marriage, and concerning abuses connected with the administration of the Lord's Supper; all of the questions arising out of the peculiar circumstances of the Corinthian church; and yet, no Christian man doubts that the rules and principles laid down in settling these special cases are still binding, touching these matters, on the whole church of God. The moral law itself, the law of the universe, was originally given to a single people for their own government.

This command comes to us, therefore, clothed with the same authority as the law of the Sabbath, or that requiring obedience to parents. A strange laxness prevails in the minds of many Christians about obeying this command. They seem to regard the whole matter of Christian beneficence somewhat in the same light as optional studies in the college curriculum, which may be taken or rejected at the pleasure of the learner. They act as if they thought it was left discretionary with them to obey this divine injunction or to neglect it. On the contrary, we see that Christians can not disobey or neglect the requirements of this passage, without setting at defiance the authority of God. But he that persistently disobeys the known will of God can hardly be called a consistent Christian. This is the first lesson which this passage yields.

2. In the second place, the inquirer would learn from this passage that this command is universal in its extent. "*Let every one of you lay by him in store.*" To every one that calls on Christ, and looks to him for salvation, this command is addressed. No one is excepted—none can be excused. It is not the rich only that are commanded to give of their abundance, but also the poor of their poverty. If benevolence be a duty, all must discharge it; if it be a privilege, all are entitled to its enjoyment. In the same passage, we learn that Paul had already given the same orders to the churches of Galatia, in which we know the poor abounded. He also desires the Corinthian brethren "to know the grace of God bestowed on the churches of Macedonia; how that, in a great trial of affliction, their deep poverty abounded unto the riches of their liberality." The apostle bestows his highest

commendation upon the poor for their cheerful compliance with his requirements. Seven hundred years before our Saviour appeared, Isaiah told us: "The Spirit of the Lord God was upon him; because the Lord hath anointed him to preach good tidings unto the meek." When the Divine Master publicly entered on his work, he explained this passage to mean "that he was anointed to preach the gospel to the poor." The crowning proof, which He offered to John of his Messiahship, was that "the poor have the gospel preached unto them." He was born of poor parents, spent his life among the poor; most of his mighty works were done among the poor, and for their benefit. Hath not God chosen the poor to enjoy most richly the blessings of the Gospel? Were they then to be excluded from all share in spreading the glad tidings in the world? He that loved the poor so well has not so shaped his system. On the contrary, He has so arranged his plan for promulgating the truth, that the gifts of the poor are essential to its success. Nor have the rich any advantage of the poor in the exercise of this grace: we are miserably mistaken if we suppose that it is the amount of our contributions that commends them to God. The all-sufficient God does not need the meager offerings of his people. "If I were hungry, I would not tell thee." This whole plan of carrying on his cause in the world, by the gifts of his people, was ordained in order to relax the griping power of selfishness in the human soul; to draw from it streams of benevolence and love; to make His people like unto Himself. It is not the greatness of the gift, but its spirit—the willingness and self-denial that are in it—that gives it value in the eyes of our Lord.

Both the Divine Master and Paul have distinctly settled this principle. While urging this very point, of cheerful giving, the apostle says, "for, if there be first a willing mind, it is accepted according to that a man hath, and not according to that he hath not." "The willing mind" is the acceptable quality in the gift. Our kind Master knows, exactly, how much he has bestowed on his stewards, and does not expect more than he has given them. And the blessed Head of the church, on one occasion sitting over against the treasury, saw a "certain poor widow" come and "throw in two mites, which

make a farthing;" and added, in his most solemn manner, "verily, I say unto you, that this poor widow hath cast more in than all they which have cast into the treasury." In behalf of God's poor we bless his name, that he has told us so plainly why he pronounced her gift greater than the larger sums of the rich. "For," says He, "all they did cast in of their abundance, but she of her want, did cast in all that she had, even all her living." Her beneficence met divine approbation, because there was in it more love, more sacrifice. Let, therefore, no member of the church say, "I have nothing to give." The only meaning such language has, in the mouths of many is, that they can not make handsome donations like their wealthy neighbors. They do not mean, that they could not give a mite. If a mite be all that you can afford, give it cheerfully; God only asks what you have, and not what you have not.

Although not contained directly in this command of the apostle, it is no violent inference from it to say, that it is the duty of parents to train up their children in this branch of piety, as well as every other. They should be encouraged to earn something, or to deny themselves some pleasure, that they may give in their own names to all benevolent operations. If neither of these methods is feasible, though much inferior in its effects, parents ought to divide their own gifts, allowing each child to give a part. The importance of early training is not more to be seen in any branch of true piety than in this. It is extremely difficult for a man, who is brought into the church late in life, and only then begins to give, ever to become truly liberal. The command is addressed to all Christians. This is the second lesson.

3. The third important principle settled for the Christian, desiring to know his duty is, that the exercise of this grace, must be stated and frequent. "*Upon the first day of the week* let every one of you lay by him." In whatever way the collection was to be made, it must be made weekly. Nothing is said definitely, for or against collections in the church, but only that a portion of our income be laid aside for benevolence on the Sabbath day. There is, however, no evidence that Paul meant to exclude collections from the church, but the reverse. If he intended to instruct Christians to lay aside their gifts on



the Sabbath, *at home*, the injunction would seem to defeat itself; for the "gathering" which he desired to avoid would still have to be accomplished after his arrival. On the contrary, one of the strongest reasons for the appointment of the Sabbath day, was because the early Christians assembled on that day for worship. It was, too, in accordance with Jewish custom, to take up collections for the poor on the Sabbath. Many other reasons make it highly suitable for the Sabbath to be appointed for this service. "It secures the constant action of the heart in the work." We must not only worship God, but "do good on the Sabbath day." The Sabbath is a day of thankfulness and joy, and, therefore, we are invited with gratitude to make our offerings unto the Lord. The Sabbath celebrates the most joyful event in the history of the world, the resurrection of the Son of God; how appropriate, then, that deeds of charity should mingle with our songs of praise to our risen Redeemer. But the strongest of all reasons for the appointment of the Sabbath was, what we shall more fully understand hereafter, that the Scriptures regard almsgiving as a religious exercise, and therefore eminently appropriate to the Sabbath day and to the house of God. It should, therefore, be discharged on the sacred day, and in the great congregation, when the affections are most elevated by the worship of God.

From all of these reasons for the appointment of the Sabbath we are clearly taught how frequently it ought to be exercised. The plain teaching of the law is, that collections should be raised every Sabbath, in connection with the public worship of God. We believe that the law is still literally in force, and that it would greatly promote the interests of the church, pecuniarily and spiritually, if it were now strictly obeyed. And by comparing the practice of the church with this requirement, we see how far she has departed from the apostolic standard. The principle is, doubtless, difficult of application, by many persons. Those whose gains are not weekly, who can not so frequently learn the condition of their business, do not find literal obedience to the precept easy. While it suits one Christian better to give weekly, and another monthly, the very least that will fulfil the demands of this law is, that the giver must, at frequent and stated intervals, examine his



income, and assess upon it a proper per centage, and consecrate it to benevolent purposes. "It must be frequent, that it may keep pace with his earnings; it ought to be stated that it may not be forgotten." The essential requirement of the passage is, that beneficence must be systematic. Perhaps the best method, for the greatest number of persons, is the per centage system. Let Christians, in view of all their circumstances, settle on a proper proportion of their income, and then consecrate it to God's service. Let this proportion agreed upon be frequently revised, that it may be kept conformed to their changing circumstances, and that their hearts may be frequently exercised on the matter. This proportion, whether it be a great or a small sum, should then be held as a sacred possession.

4. This divine law, which we are interpreting, would teach the inquiring Christian, what proportion of his property should be devoted to God. The law is very explicit and clear: "*as God hath prospered him.*" Nothing less than the consecration to beneficence of a part of our estates and incomes, proportioned to the prosperity which God has bestowed, will at all satisfy this divine requirement. No matter how much we may give, if it be not in proportion to the prosperity with which God has blessed us, it is still the benevolence of Ananias and Sapphira. No matter how small our gifts, if this principle control them, they are acceptable to the Master.

The idea of proportional beneficence is taught, in many forms, in the Scriptures. "If any man minister, let him do it of the ability which God giveth." "As we have opportunity, let us do good to all men." Where much is given, much will be required. Our Lord is a kind master; he does not require us to serve him beyond our means; but he does insist that our service shall correspond to the ability which he hath bestowed. Let us endeavor to study more fully the application of this rule to the question of our duty.

a. This precept requires that our beneficence be proportioned to the sum total of our property. It has been shown in a former passage, that God is the author of all wealth, and the sovereign bestower of all that man, his steward, possesses. No man can gather any more wealth than God bestows on him; no man of industry and economy has less than this sum. The

aggregate of men's estates, therefore, corresponds exactly to the prosperity which God has bestowed on them. It is apparent, then, that our benevolence must correspond to the sum total of our possessions. The rich are bound to give a much larger sum absolutely than the poor. The man of moderate means can not so well afford to diminish the aggregate of his estate lest his income entirely fail. It may be the duty of many rich men to give to benevolent purposes half of their estates. After a Christian man's estate has reached the point of ample sufficiency, for the support of himself and family, and for providing a moderate portion for his children, it may be his duty to give all of his future increase to God's cause. Of course, we are not teaching that it is always wrong for men to *accumulate* property. It is a duty to be "diligent in business;" the result of which is the increase of property. Large fortunes are very useful in the business of this world; and, if held as consecrated possessions, and for the glory of God, are very important to the success of the church. But is it right for Christians to pursue, through life, an unbroken course of accumulation, withholding from a world famishing for the bread of life, tens of thousands, simply as a security for their own ease, and for the aggrandizement of their children? Would not many Christians give up, at once, to the conversion of the world, thousands, and some even millions, if the love of Christ constrained them, as it did Paul?

But it is a poor means that some Christians have discovered of trying to atone for a life-long inconsistency in this matter, by devising, to benevolent purposes, large sums in their wills. This device, besides, being in many cases an attempt to satisfy conscience for long neglect of duty, is liable to the serious objection, that it dodges the responsibility laid personally on the Christian. You are God's steward for whatever he has given you. You have no right to postpone, till after death, the payment of the fruits of your vineyard. To withhold, from a perishing world, all that the Lord has given us, to use it for our own comfort and glory, as long as we live, and then magnanimously determine to give it to him, when we can no longer retain it, is doubtful beneficence. In benevolent matters, it is best for every one to be the executor of his own will. The moment you place it in God's hands it is safe forever.

b. Our charities must be strictly proportioned to our annual income. Income is not always proportioned to the sum total of property. Many persons have large incomes who have but little estate; many receive fine salaries, who have but little fixed capital. Manifestly, therefore, the larger the income, the higher per centage of it ought to be devoted to benevolence. A poor widow may not be able to give a tenth of her income, without denying her children necessary bread. A day laborer can not as well spare five dollars from his annual gains, as many a rich man can spare five thousand. In early life, when the income is barely sufficient to support one's family, duty to those whom God has made dependent on him, may require the young Christian to content himself with devoting a very small proportion of his income to charitable uses. Most certainly, when his income has been greatly enlarged, and a considerable surplus remains over, after the support of his family, he is not at liberty to keep the proportion fixed at the same rate. A tenth, or even a less sum (owing to the *smallness* of his income) may, at one time, have fully met the requirement of the divine law, while at another time a half may no more than satisfy its demands.

These seem to be the two leading principles that ought regulate the beneficence of those who have property or income; but there are many of God's children who have not much of either. What do the Scriptures teach about the duty of such persons?

c. Christians are required to labor diligently, that they "may have to give to him that needeth." In man's present condition, labor is a blessing to his physical, mental, and moral nature. The law of God's government is: "If any man work not, neither should he eat." No Christian is allowed to be "slothful in business." Both idleness and laziness are sins. Thousands of professors of religion sin daily by doing nothing. A sincere and active Christian regards every power of body and mind, as a talent from his heavenly Father, and is industrious in the employment of them for his glory. If, therefore, any of the people of God, have no other means of exercising the grace of liberality, the divine law requires them to labor with their own powers of body and mind, that they may obtain the necessary means. Many a man, now receiving aid from others, might, by industry,

become himself the joyful dispenser of alms. But the wealthy more need this exhortation, because they do not feel the necessity of personal exertion. Many Christians seem to think they have a perfect right to retire from business, as soon as they have amassed a sufficient fortune to sustain themselves and families, in ease and luxury, for the remainder of their days. But is the treasury of the Lord full enough? Are not myriads of souls perishing in perdition every year, for the want of means to send them the Gospel? If any Christian has enough for himself, why not spend the remainder of his days, in productive labor, for the purpose of doing good? How many additional stars might many a Christian set in his crown of rejoicing.

d. Self-denial must be called to our aid, in providing funds, for the exercise of Christian benevolence. Our glorious Head, "who was God, and thought it no robbery to be equal with God," gave the universe the highest example of self-denial. In the exercise of this virtue, our Divine Master requires all his people to imitate his footsteps. "If any man will come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross, and follow me." It is, also, essential to discipleship: "And whosoever doth not bear his cross, and come after me, can not be my disciple." Unsanctified human nature is extremely selfish, loving its ease, seeking the indulgence of its passions, and the gratification of its appetites. This self-indulgent spirit must be eradicated from the soul. There is no earthly good, that the Christian must not be willing to give up, for the sake of Christ. If any Christian is unable, otherwise, to cast anything into the Lord's treasury, it is a Christian duty to deny himself that he may obtain the means. If Christians can not, in any other manner, obtain the means of being beneficent, they must curtail their expenses, simplify their mode of living, practice economy, dispense with all luxuries and elegancies, before they decrease their contributions to their Saviour's cause. Our very flesh must feel want, before we allow our Saviour's glory to suffer, and souls to perish. It is sinful for Christians to say, "we have nothing to give," when they and their families "are clothed in fine linen, and faring sumptuously every day." This was the quality in the poor widow's mite, which made it so precious in the eyes of the Saviour,

while the large gifts of the rich passed unnoticed. And here is a solemn warning to the rich, who give only of their superfluity, and never feel what they give. Can this be the Saviour's meaning when He says, "verily I say unto you, That a rich man shall hardly enter into the kingdom of heaven?" These four principles on which we have commented at length, contain the chief points of the system of beneficence prescribed in the Scriptures.

III. Let us briefly notice a few, of the many, advantages of this system.

1. It provides regularly for beneficence as one of our necessary expenditures. How strange that a Christian, who regards himself as a steward of God, should determine all his estimates for the coming year, without making any provision for his Lord's portion. And yet the great majority of Christians do so act. The system here commended would induce a Christian, when he sits down at the beginning of the year, to adjust his expenditures to his probable income, to make beneficence one of the regular items of his expenditures. In truth, the Lord's portion is, first, to be taken from his whole income, and the remainder distributed among his various accounts. If we have an annual income of a thousand dollars, and if one tenth be the moderate proportion which we have devoted to religion; one hundred dollars are first subtracted and placed in a separate column, and considered sacred to religion. This amount, then, is always ready. In the minds of many Christians, a hard battle has to be fought with selfish interests; many others are sincerely perplexed to decide between the claims of their families, and their business, and those of religion, as often as the Lord calls for any part of the revenues of his kingdom. A systematic plan at once removes this difficulty by securing a decisive victory at the beginning of life; and all that is necessary thereafter, is to adjust the proportion of his income to his changing circumstances. This systematic exercise of this grace would also save Christians from many hurtful errors. Under the ordinary system of irregular and fitful giving, because they give quite a sum on some important occasion, they are left under the impression that they have given more than they have. A systematic giver knows exactly how much he has given, and

how much remains to be disposed of in this way. It also takes away from Christians the small excuse which they often make, "I have no money." The only sense in which this is true of many men is, that they have none on that particular occasion. They have had it, they have loaned it for interest, or they have otherwise invested it. Had they been acting on any proper system, they never would have disposed of the Lord's portion.

Such a system would also remove the objection, that collections come too often. A systematic giver has already made his appropriation to each benevolent cause; and it makes but little difference to him whether collections are made at short or long intervals.

2. Some such plan, as we are unfolding, would dispense with all special agencies for the collection of funds, which are always costly, and frequently injurious to the grace of liberality. Of course this system, if adopted by all our churches, would save the entire expense attending the agency system. Where this system has been depended on, its cost has always consumed a considerable part of the entire sum raised for benevolent purposes. But a far graver objection to "agents" than their costliness is, that they largely fail to cultivate the grace of liberality in the heart of God's people. That careful examination of the Scriptures, on which we are insisting, can not be made without producing the conviction that systematic beneficence is a part of true religion, and that every Christian is bound, in conscience, to be a liberal and cheerful giver. Why, then, should the cultivation of this branch of true piety be taken out of the hands of the pastor and session, the divinely-appointed overseers of God's house, and committed to an agent, any more than the prayers and faith of the church? Pastors and sessions not only have far greater advantages for cultivating this grace, but they have no liberty, from their Divine Master, to allow the control of this ordinance to pass out of their hands. Not only is the system itself thus wrong, but agents have not always plied the church with the most proper motives. The Apostle of the Gentiles seems to have intended to correct this capital error, when he directed this particular system to be adopted, in order "that there be no gatherings when I come." Surely he would have obtained a larger collection, if he had waited till he reached



Corinth, and then portrayed, in lively colors, the sufferings of the poor saints at Jerusalem. Paul, full of humility as he was, could not have been ignorant of his own splendid oratorical power, nor of the effect on the imaginative Greeks, of such a tale of suffering and sorrow as he could justly have unfolded. How fine a field for Paul's eloquence! what sufferings! what trials! what heroic endurance for Christ's sake! what tearful sympathy he might have excited! what a magnificent collection he might have secured! And yet Paul deliberately cuts himself off from all this advantage, by insisting, that there be no "gatherings" when he arrived. What could have been his motive? His object was not merely to obtain a large collection, but to form, in the Corinthians, the habit of systematic giving. For this reason, he brought to bear on their hearts no motive inferior to God's supreme authority and the constraining love of Christ. His argument was one purely evangelical, formed of pure gospel elements.

How nearly the usage of the Presbyterian Church, in raising funds, has conformed to this apostolic example, her people well know. What have been the motives generally brought to bear, by special agents, on our churches? Did they often make a thorough discussion of Christian beneficence, in its principles, showing it to be a certain effect of conversion, and a duty which none can fail to discharge and be loyal to Christ? Was it not usually the burden of their efforts to arouse our sympathies for the perishing heathen, or the suffering missionary toiling in our western wilds, or the candidate for the ministry struggling to secure an education, with which to serve his Divine Master? All of which are motives not wrong, but not the highest. Christians were begged to give, as if they had a right to refuse. The result was a "temporary ebullition of sympathy, a fitful, meteoric burst of feeling, followed by a long period of apathy and inaction." Perhaps a larger sum was obtained at that time, depending, however, largely upon the skill and eloquence of the agent, but the heart only closed the tighter for this sudden surprise. But these transient flashes of benevolent impulse are no more like that elevated Christian feeling, produced by deeply pondering the principles of the gospel, than the noisy and uncer-



tain mountain torrent is like the deep, perennial river that ever spreads life and beauty along its shores.

3. The apostle's plan would tend to give our charities more of the character of "free-will offerings." We are clearly taught that our gifts, however large, are not acceptable to the Lord, unless given with a cheerful spirit. In the gospel, the Lord has not given us a written statute, regulating the details of our charities, as he did to his ancient people; but he has left the number and amount of their gifts to be determined by the love of his people. Love always acts freely and cheerfully. Very much, however, of what is given, under the ordinary system, is wrung from its possessors by various motives. From some it is simply begged, by the importunity of the agent or the pastor; others give for the good name it gives them; some to keep even with their neighbors; others grudgingly. Perhaps they had not intended to give much when they went to church, but owing to the pungency of the sermon, the force of the argument, or the tenderness of the appeal, their consciences compelled them to give more, but of course they could not do it cheerfully. Alas! how much, even of the small sums raised in our churches, is given from some imperfect or deficient motive. Such gifts may be used by the Lord for good, because they were already his own; but the rich blessing attached to giving is wholly forfeited by the donor.

All of these serious evils are prevented by the plan prescribed for the Corinthians. One of the strongest reasons for the adoption of this regular system is, "that it is expedient for you who have begun before, not only to do, but also to be forward a year ago," "to make up beforehand your bounty whereof ye had notice before, that the same might be ready, as a matter of bounty, and not of covetousness." He urges them, in strong language, to give cheerfully. "Every man as he purposeth in his heart, so let him give, not grudgingly, or of necessity; for God loveth a cheerful giver." To them of Macedonia, he holds up the fact that "Achaia was ready a year ago." Then in turn, holds up to the Corinthians "the grace of God bestowed on the churches of Macedonia." See, too, what a glorious illustration his system finds in these same poor Macedonian Christians. It is not Paul, but they

that beg, that he would accept their offering and hasten with it to Jerusalem. "For to their power, I bear record, yea, and beyond their power, they were willing of themselves; praying us with much entreaty that we would receive the gift, and take upon us the fellowship of the ministering to the saints." This is the spirit which the adoption of this system produces in the hearts of Christians. When a man's sum is already separated, and consecrated to God, conscience will not let him keep it. If the church neglect the matter, he will seek a channel through which to forward his own gifts. It is more blessed for such a soul to give than to receive.

4. This system would conduce to business habits, and produce incidentally various good results. The frequent examination of one's income for the purpose of regulating the proper proportion of it to be given to benevolence, would produce a happy effect in keeping him acquainted with the exact condition of his business. Many persons labor under serious error as to the amount of their incomes. Many farmers in our country contend, that even in good times, they do not make three per cent. on the capital invested in their farms. Of course, they mean by this statement, that they do not clear this amount, after they and their large families have eaten, and worn, and wasted, as much as their hearts can wish. Let them, however, charge their farms with fair rent, cost of seeds, manures, implements, stock, and labor, then let them credit them with every production, every bushel of grain of every kind, all hay, fodder and oats, every head of stock reared, all milk, butter and cheese, all vegetables and fruits; let all these be computed at the market value, making no allowance for living, and it will be clearly seen, that their farms are far more profitable than was supposed. It is manifest that this is the true method of estimating an income, in order to determine the proper amount to be devoted to benevolence. And yet how many Christian farmers say they have no incomes, because they have consumed large sums in bountiful living.

Another good effect of this system is to promote sobriety and prudence in business. We earnestly believe the habit of many Christian men of trading every year to such an extent, as, in case of failure, to involve their whole estates, thereby

staking the peace and comfort of their families and their ability to give anything to the Lord's service, upon the uncertainties of a single trade, to be reckless and sinful. When a Christian has consecrated all his possessions to his Saviour, he is not willing to engage in such hazardous enterprises.

5. The last advantage of this system, which we mention, is that its general adoption would secure largely increased funds for benevolent uses. It is a lamentable fact, that a large number of our congregations contribute nothing to the boards of our church; some give to one or two, some neglect all of them. In particular churches, many members neglect the duty of beneficence wholly or in part. The practical effect of introducing such a scheme into a presbytery would be by the force of example, and by inquiries which the presbytery should annually make into the working of the scheme, to induce all the churches, under the care of the body, ultimately to practice the system. The effect of adopting such a plan, by a particular church, would be gradually to draw all the members into its operation. Again, a systematic plan will greatly increase the aggregate sum obtained. Many know to their sorrow, the silent, deceptive power of interest to accumulate. On the same principle, a regular per centum of our incomes would produce surprisingly large sums for benevolence. The deep snow is accumulated by the falling of imperceptible flakes; the mighty river first fell on the mountain tops, in the small streams of the rain showers. The Romish Church gathers vast sums by the collection of Peter's pence. These are a few of the many advantages, which this scriptural plan enjoys over every other method of exercising this grace. We have now closed all that we have to say upon the system of beneficence prescribed in the Scriptures, and have come to the second part of this article, in which we propose to discuss the motives which the Scriptures bring to bear on Christians, to induce them to exercise freely and joyfully this Christian grace.

#### PART SECOND.

In discussing the fourth important precept, derived from the Apostle's command to the Corinthians, namely, the proportion of our property which we ought to devote to benevolent pur-

poses, we found that the terms of the law were indefinite; that though a proportionate principle was taught clearly enough, yet the fixing of the per centage is left to the enlightened understanding and Christian conscience of believers. According to the degree of grace with which Christians are endowed, one would fix the rate much higher than another. One servant may be contented with a tenth, another's heart may prompt him to bestow a fifth, while so consuming may be the love of another that he joyfully pours out the half or even all of his gains. Here, then, is precisely the point for instruction, for argument, for exhortation—the place to set forth, in strong light, the motives to the exercise of this grace, with which the Scriptures ply the Christian's heart. How much shall we give? How high shall we fix the proportion? What instruction has the statute book of the king given to guide us in adjusting, from time to time, the per centage of our changing incomes? On this point, the argument of the Scriptures is exceedingly clear and forcible.

I. That we may be able to appreciate, in its full force, the accumulating power of the scriptural argument, let us recall here, in a word, the point made in the beginning of this article—that God, the Creator, is the source of all wealth; that he bestows riches on men in his sovereign pleasure; that he intrusts his possessions to different stewards, and according to their ability; and that he requires of them faithful management, and punctual payment of interest. Our first argument, then, is that man and all he has belongs to God; that God's right to demand all, or any portion of man's possessions, is absolute, and that man's duty to return whatever his Divine Ruler calls for is simple justice.

II. In the second place, let us turn to the Mosaic and patriarchal systems, and there learn how God himself settled the principle of Christian liberality. In studying this first ritual of God's Church, we soon discover that no doctrine holds a higher position in it than that of Christian beneficence. It impressed God's image and superscription upon every species of property. The firstling of every clean beast was claimed for the service of religion. The first-fruits of every field and vineyard, must be devoted to God. In reaping, the corners of the field were to be left for the poor.

These were the ears of corn which the pious Ruth was glean-  
ing in the fields of her rich kinsman. Every first-born male  
child, with which the Jewish parent was blessed, must be  
redeemed with silver. And it was an unalterable statute in  
Israel, that every Jewish farmer must devote one tenth of  
all the produce of his flocks and fields and vineyards to the  
support of the religious teachers of the land. A second tenth  
was also devoted to religious feasts and to the poor. Two  
years in succession, the people were required to go up to  
Jerusalem, and spend this second tenth in feasts and presents;  
the third year they were to spend it at home in feasts, for the  
widow, and orphan, and stranger, and poor of every descrip-  
tion. Every seventh year was the great Sabbath, during  
which all the land must lie idle, and be allowed to produce  
spontaneously for the poor. Once in seven years all debts  
must be forgiven throughout the nation. Three times every  
year, every male Israelite was required to make a long and  
expensive journey to Jerusalem, to wait for many days on  
the Lord. In addition to all these direct levies upon their  
property, the Jews were required to support the most costly  
system of sacrifices, ever borne by any nation. The bloody  
sacrifices demanded thousands of the chosen beasts of their  
flocks. The unbloody offerings were scarcely less numerous  
or costly, and might be indefinitely increased according to the  
piety and hospitality of the worshiper. After a careful exami-  
nation of these various sums, it will be seen that, in the aggre-  
gate, the Mosaic system required, for benevolent purposes,  
not less than one-third of all the productions of the Jewish  
people. This whole economy, given by inspiration, constantly  
reminded the Jew that he was only the steward of God, who  
was the true proprietor of all his herds and fields.

Nor was the patriarchal system less remarkable for the relig-  
ious consecration of property. Abram, returning from the  
slaughter of the kings, gave tithes of all the spoils to the king  
of Salem, who was priest of the Most High God. Jacob,  
fleeing from the face of his angry brother, vows, that if God  
will keep him, in all the way, "Of all that thou shalt give  
me—the tenth—I will surely give thee." This practice seems  
to have trained the Jewish people for the reception of the  
Mosaic system, and for that remarkable exhibition of liberal-

ity made by them soon after they left Egypt. Considering all their circumstances, no more magnificent display of beneficence has ever been made in the Christian church, than that exhibited by the Jews, in answer to the call of Moses for materials with which to build the tabernacle. Just escaped from degrading slavery in Egypt, with no means of increasing their resources, with a long wandering, and a fierce war before them, they were the last people in whom to find so high a development of this grace. The call was for a very large sum, and yet so freely do they pour forth their treasures, that Moses is compelled to issue an order that no more offerings be accepted. By careful calculation, the sum of their gifts is supposed to have reached the aggregate of many millions of our money.

Passing down to the reign of David, we find another splendid illustration of the practical working of this system. Although David was not permitted to build a house for the Lord, yet with devoted piety he made the most extensive preparations for the work. "Behold, now," says he to his son, "in my trouble I have prepared for the house of the Lord, a hundred thousand talents of gold, and a thousand thousand talents of silver; and brass and iron without weight; for it is in abundance; timber also and stone have I prepared; and thou mayest add thereto." David's princes, and captains, and the chiefs of the fathers also "offered willingly." Out of these vast preparations the temple was reared at a cost, as some good authorities say, of more than three thousand millions of American dollars. In his last prayer the Psalmist tells us the principle on which he and the people acted in making this magnificent offering. "O Lord our God, all this store that we have prepared to build thee a house for thine holy name, cometh of thine hand, and is all thine own; for all things are of thee, and of thine own, have we given thee." What a clear expression of the idea of Christian stewardship! How strongly did those pious Jews feel that the silver and gold are the Lord's.

III. Let us now inquire what motives the gospel dispensation offers to Christians, to induce them to consecrate a large proportion of their substance to the service of the Lord. But let none reject the conclusion that must be drawn from



the old dispensations, hoping to find a lower standard erected in the gospel. In passing from the types and shadows of the old economy, to the full light and glory of the spiritual dispensation, we ought rather to expect to find prescribed for us a more liberal and beneficent system. If these poor and half-civilized Jews, just escaping from the bonds of Egyptian slavery, could support such a system of beneficence, as we have just described; if, in the contracted sphere which the church was then called to fill, without a single missionary operation to conduct, without a single college to build, or theological seminary to found and maintain, this system of beneficence was considered necessary by divine wisdom; what may we not expect under the dispensation of love under which we live, with a field which is the world, and the commission to preach the gospel to every creature, and with all our ministry to educate by the slow and costly process of the college and seminary?

1. The first strong motive, by which the gospel urges the Christian to devote a large amount of his possessions to his Saviour's service, is drawn from Redemption. The people of God have all been redeemed by their Saviour's precious blood. When we were enemies, Christ died for us. When we had become the heirs of eternal death, He purchased our title to life. When we were the bond-slaves of Satan, Christ laid down his life for our redemption.

No more powerful or tender motive can be addressed to the Christian. No man that really believes that he was once an heir of hell, and that the Redeemer laid down his life for his soul; that ever felt the burden of sin, and the sweetness of pardon, can fail to love his Saviour, or resist the constraining power of that love to devote all he has to God. Therefore, by as much as Christians prize their deliverance from the hateful dominion of Satan, as they rejoice over their escape from hell, as they value their adoption into the family of God, by the estimate they put upon the eternal weight of glory which they hope to enjoy hereafter; by all these resistless motives they are bound to dedicate themselves, soul and body, time and talents, wealth and influence, all they have and are, to their Redeemer.

2. The Christian must exercise liberality, because the sup-



port of our Saviour's kingdom, by the payment of tribute to him, is the expression of our allegiance to him. The Scriptures leave no room to doubt that the world, and everything in it, have been given to the Lord Jesus Christ as Mediatorial King. In the Covenant of Redemption, made between the Father and the Son, touching the salvation of sinners, not only were his own people given to him, but all things, the world with all its resources, men and angels. The Saviour plainly affirms "that all things are delivered unto me of my Father." Again, He says, "All power is given unto me, in heaven and earth." The original word for "power" means authority, dominion, rule. It is often used for princes and potentates among the angels, and among men for rulers and magistrates. The meaning, then, of the passage is, that, in the economy of grace, all the material wealth and resources of the universe have been placed at the disposal of God-Man, Mediator, and that He has received, by commission, the right of supreme dominion over all angels, pure and fallen, and over all men, rulers and subjects. The Apostle Paul states positively that "He is the head over all things to the church." He is elsewhere called "the Lord of lords, and the King of kings." According to these Scriptures, the Mediator is the present supreme ruler of the universe, making all men and all things subservient to the advancement of his kingdom. Above all the monarchs and rulers of the earth, independent of their mightiest works and wisest schemes, sits Zion's King, raising up one ruler, and casting down another, founding one empire, and overturning another, claiming supreme allegiance from every intelligent being, and exercising all this dominion for the extension and glory of his church.

Now, it is the plain teaching of the word of God, that every chief magistrate, lawfully in power, has an undisputed right to so much of the revenues of his kingdom, as may be necessary for the support of his government. On this principle, every acre of soil, every flock and herd, all the gold and silver, belong to the Mediatorial King. Whenever, therefore, our Divine King needs any portion of his own revenues, for the purpose of conducting his government, for the support of his officers and laborers, for the extension of his dominion, or the feeding of his poor—his right to receive it is absolute,

and the duty of his people to pay it into his treasury is positive. One of the prime duties of citizenship among men is the payment of the revenues of the kingdom; and no man is called an obedient citizen who refuses this plain obligation. By the willing discharge of this plain duty to Christ, Christians express their willing allegiance to their King. If the Lord Jesus Christ be the Mediatorial King, ruling the universe for the glory of his church; if Christians be the blood-bought and now voluntary members of his kingdom, their first and most bounden duty is to sustain the government of their King, by paying their means into his treasury.

To the members of his church, every one of them bought by his own blood, this argument comes with peculiar force. Our Saviour has purchased, by the sacrifice of himself, our forfeited lives, our time and services, then intrusted us with the revenues of his kingdom, and staked its extension in the world, and the salvation of men, upon the liberality of his people. Not one of our King's chariot wheels can turn, no gospel can be preached at home, no preacher can be educated, no missionary can be sent to plant the cross on heathen shores, without money. Every heart that is loyal to Jesus, will desire, above all things, to see him worshiped by every human being, and will give liberally of his means until every soul acknowledge the sway of his mild scepter.

3. Beneficence is the necessary effect of regeneration, and is, therefore, treated in the Scriptures as a grace of the Divine Spirit, and classed, in value and acceptability to God, with sacrifice and prayer. This grace grows as naturally and certainly out of the renewed heart, as the quality of the fruit is determined by the nature of the tree. Until conversion, selfishness in some form is the ruling principle of man's heart. To aggrandize or gratify themselves, employs the energies of most unrenewed men. Making money, as a means or an end, and the love of it, are among the most common developments of selfishness.

The Christian is a man whose heart has been changed by the power of the Holy Spirit, who has been made "a new creature in Christ," with whom "old things have passed away," with whom "all things have become new." He has new views and feelings, new loves and hates, new principles

and aims, and new labors and ends. Without this radical change, there can be no true religion in the soul. In the soul in which this change has occurred, the dominion of selfishness, as of every sin, is broken, though its deliverance is not always complete. Every such renewed soul the Holy Ghost makes his temple, and adorns it with every heavenly grace. But we are not left in the slightest doubt about this being a grace of the Spirit. Paul distinctly calls it a grace, and classes it with other indisputable graces. In the exposition, which he makes of this important doctrine, in his second letter to the Corinthians, he wishes them to know "the *grace* of God bestowed on the churches of Macedonia," which grace, he clearly teaches us in the following verses, was their liberality toward the poor saints at Jerusalem. Again, he exhorts them: "As ye abound in everything, in faith, and utterance, and knowledge, and in all diligence, and in your love to us, see that ye abound in this *grace* also." Here we have an inspired apostle classing Christian liberality in the same rank with faith, without which it is impossible to please God, and with Christian love, without which, another apostle says, man is a murderer. No language, nor any number of quotations from the Scriptures, can more clearly express the gracious nature of Christian liberality. This, therefore, is one of the graces which the Divine Spirit certainly brings with him when he takes up his abode in the renewed heart. No man can be born of God, and not be benevolent; unbroken selfishness is strong evidence against regeneration. We are not deterred from making this strong statement, by the fact that many professors of religion fail almost entirely to exercise this grace, although they maintain, in many respects, a credible profession of faith. "For this ye know," says Paul, "that no whoremonger, nor unclean person, nor covetous man, who is an idolator, hath any inheritance in the kingdom of Christ and of God." These words exclude a covetous man from the pale of religion, and from the gates of Heaven. "The Holy Ghost never committed such an oversight, as to regenerate a soul, and leave it under the power of covetousness. The product of the new birth is a new man, with all the members of a man developed, not one mutilated and wanting in this or that limb. Every grace of the Spirit has a propor-

fionate, though it may be a feeble development. And it would be no more absurd to speak of a Christian without faith, than of a Christian without beneficence. A Christian infidel is no more a contradiction in terms than a Christian without charity." This is one of a chain of graces, out of which, if one link be wanting, it will not be strong enough to bind the soul to the throne of God. The growth of the soul in grace is like the growth of the healthy body, all the members grow together. To say, therefore, that a man is a good Christian, but that he will give nothing, and sacrifice nothing, for the support of the gospel, and for the extension of his Saviour's glory in the world, is to use improper language. The certain effect of grace in the soul is to make a man liberal. But this grace, we are taught, is equally as acceptable to God as sacrifice and prayer. Paul, with a heart filled with gratitude, writing to his Philippian brethren, assures them that the little offering, which they had sent him by the hand of Epaphroditus, was "an odor of a sweet smell, a sacrifice well pleasing to God." The angel of the Lord assures Cornelius that his "prayers and alms had come up for a memorial before God." "Prayers and alms," says Alexander, "are the two kinds of religious service previously mentioned, as the proof of the centurion's devout regard to the Divine will and the true religion." The divine messenger classes his prayers and alms together, as being alike acceptable to God. The delight which God takes in this exercise of true piety can not be expressed in stronger language or more beautiful imagery. In the same manner, as the fragrant vapor ascended from the golden altar of incense, and pacified the angry Jehovah, and as the prayers of the saints, perfumed by the merit of Christ's death, are now treasured in golden vials by our reconciled Father, so is he pleased with the exercise of this grace.

But, of the acceptableness of this grace to our Divine Father, we are left in no doubt. As prayer is the outward expression of humility, of dependence, of faith and love in the soul, so almsgiving is the expression of the graces of gratitude and love, and is accepted as such by the Lord. "Bring ye all the tithes into the storehouse," says Malachi, "that there may be meat in mine house, and prove me now herewith, saith the

Lord of hosts, if I will not open to you the windows of heaven, and pour you out a blessing, that there shall not be room enough to receive it." In the previous verse of this chapter, the people "are cursed with a curse," because they had robbed God in not paying their tithes and offerings; and in this verse the richest blessings are promised in answer to the discharge of this duty. Paul urges his Hebrew brethren "to do good and to communicate, forget not, for with such sacrifices God is well pleased." And again, the apostle shows his appreciation of this grace, by appointing that it be exercised on the first day of the week, in connection with other regular parts of divine worship.

4. The peculiar pleasure which the Lord takes in the free and voluntary exercise of this grace, seems to explain the costly nature of the system prescribed by Moses, and the lavish expenditure made on several great occasions by the Jewish people. When Solomon had finished the magnificent temple, for which his father had so long prepared, he dedicated it to God with a sacrifice of "two and twenty thousand oxen, and a hundred and twenty thousand sheep." Many other similar sacrifices are recorded in the Old Testament. From the position which we have found the Scriptures assigning to this grace, we see that, instead of these sacrifices being merely wasteful and extravagant displays, they are joyful expressions of gratitude, which are highly acceptable to Jehovah. How strangely do these magnificent contributions contrast with those of many modern Christians, when they offer, out of boundless wealth, a mere pittance to the Lord that bought them!

5. That we have given the correct interpretation of the word of God touching this important part of Christian duty, we refer to the high authority of our own standards. Although we believe fully in the doctrine of these venerable symbols, that nothing but the word of God can bind the conscience, yet these standards have the highest authority, with so many of God's people as have received them, as containing the correct interpretation of divine truth. The Confession of Faith says, "saints by profession are bound to maintain a holy fellowship and communion in the worship of God, and in performing such other spiritual services as tend to their mutual edifica-

tion; as also in relieving each other in outward things, according to their several abilities and necessities." The Form of Government classes along with the ordinances of prayer and praise, expounding and preaching the word, that of "making collections for the poor, and other pious purposes." The Directory for Worship orders, that "the sermon being ended, the minister is to pray, and return thanks to Almighty God; then let a psalm be sung; a collection raised for the poor, or other purposes of the church." These quotations clearly teach us, that our venerable church considers liberality a grace of the Divine Spirit, and its exercise in almsgiving as worthy to have a place in the devotional services of God's people, in the sanctuary, on the Sabbath day.

6. And the last authority which we offer, as to the meaning of the divine word, is that of the General Assembly, the highest court in the church. This venerable body has repeatedly affirmed, not only that liberality is a grace of the Spirit, but has taken still higher ground, and declared that almsgiving, which is the expression of liberality, is itself an act of worship. The Assembly of 1855, which met at Nashville, teaches the doctrine of these pages with great clearness: "It can not be denied that our churches have been too much accustomed to look upon giving as purely a matter of Christian liberty, a thing which might or might not be done, according to the impulses which happen to prevail at the moment, without, in either case, involving the integrity of Christian character; what has been given has been regarded as a bounty, and those who solicit it represented as beggars." "The law in relation to the question before us, is, that liberality is a grace of the Spirit, almsgiving an office of Christian worship, and collections for the poor and the spread of the gospel, an ordinance of God. Giving, in the Scriptures, is put upon substantially the same basis as prayer—the one is the sacrifice of the lips, and the other of the substance." "He is the beggar who solicits the favor of having his gifts accepted, and he feels it to be a distinction, that he can glorify God with the fruits of his substance."

Such is also the purport of the resolutions passed by the Assembly of 1858, of which the following is a copy of the first and third:

•



"1. Every man is a steward of God, in the management of the time and talents and substance which God has intrusted to him."

"3. Contributions of our worldly substance, for religious purposes, from religious motives, in a scriptural way, is a Christian duty, and is a part of true piety as fully and completely, as praise and prayer, sacraments, or any other religious duty or exercise. It is not one of the offices of religion which a Christian man is at liberty to neglect, or slightly perform at his own pleasure. He who is not regularly a man of prayer can not be accounted a consistent Christian, neither can he who is not regularly a man of beneficence."

The Assembly at Lexington advances a step, and boldly declares almsgiving itself to be an act of worship, and that such was the meaning of the deliverances of former Assemblies. These are its words: "The Assembly would respond to this call, by reiterating to and before all our churches, the testimony of the Assembly of Buffalo, and the Assembly at Nashville, that liberality, in giving for the support and propagation of the gospel, is a grace of the Spirit; that it is a fruit, and an evidence, and a means of grace; also, by reiterating the testimony of those Assemblies, that offerings of money for the service of the Lord *are acts of worship*, which ought to be systematically and solemnly performed by all our churches and by every Christian."

Although the Scriptures offer many inducements to the exercise of this grace, we ought not to pass from the motives which we have already set before ourselves, without attempting more fully to appreciate their richness and power. The New Testament, with the utmost clearness, requires systematic beneficence, and explains fully the plan prescribed; but in accordance with the greater liberty of the gospel dispensation, it does not, like the old economy, fix in figures the amount of each man's gifts. Its argument, however, is far more cogent, its motives much stronger, its persuasion more affectionate. As we have seen, the nearest approach that it makes to a definite statement is, that every one give "as God hath prospered him." But, when obediently and gratefully the Christian comes to the sacred writings to inquire how high he shall fix the proportion of his income, the argument



becomes irresistible: it is the argument of love. It refers the grateful soul to the Saviour's blood-bought right of redemption; it compels the soul loyal to Christ to pay his gifts into his Lord's treasury; it teaches the new-born soul that Christian beneficence grows necessarily out of the nature of true religion in the soul; that it is an important grace of God's Spirit; it assures him that his Lord accepts his offerings with the highest satisfaction. The irresistible motive which the gospel presses on every child of God, is the cross of Christ. It is an argument formed out of pure gospel materials. This is exactly Paul's method of presenting this subject to the Corinthians. His reason for writing to them, in advance, and directing that every one on the first day of the week lay by him in store, as God hath prospered him, is that "there be no gatherings when I come." How strange this clause sounds to us, who have been accustomed to our modern harrowing appeals and pitiful entreaties! Why did not Paul wait for the collection till he reached Corinth, and then with that eloquence which so overpowered the heathen on one occasion, that they brought out oxen to sacrifice to him as to a god, lead captive his audience? Why did he not portray in deepest colors the sufferings of the poor saints at Jerusalem, and excite their pity and stir up their compassion with some heart-rending scene of the Holy Land? How different was the argument of Paul! Merely pointing with one hand to their poor brethren, and with the other stretched toward distant and bloody Calvary, he directs them to the example of their bleeding Saviour, as the highest of all possible motives, exclaiming, "Ye know the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, that though he was rich, yet for your sakes he became poor, that ye through his poverty might be rich." See, says Paul, the eternal Son, in all the riches of his glory, "which he had with the Father before the world was;" see him in the manger, in Gethsemane, on Calvary, then remember that it was "for your sakes," he thus humbled himself. Think of yourselves, once "children of wrath" and heirs of hell, now joint-heirs with Christ, "to an inheritance incorruptible, undefiled, and that fadeth not away;" and then with your love thus kindled, determine how much you will give. True, the New Testament does not determine by arithmetic the amount that

the redeemed children of God must contribute; but it tells them to measure their debt of gratitude to their Saviour; it asks, in tenderest love, thrice over, "lovest thou me more than these" worldly possessions? it inquires how much do you dread hell, how much do you prize heaven? When the Divine Master presents himself in the person of the poorest of his children on earth, and you close your heart and purse against him—when you that have "this world's goods, see a brother and sister in need, and then shut up your bowels of compassion"—it asks in mingled pity and sorrow, "how dwelleth the love of God in him!" And this is the whole motive of the gospel; it neither knows nor offers any higher inducement to any good deed, than "the love of Christ constraining us." If any man resist this, the gospel has no motive more powerful.

IV. The Lord has offered a large reward for the exercise of this grace. Good works do not merit any reward from God; for when we have done all our duty, the Saviour has taught us to say, "that we are unprofitable servants." While this is true, the Lord has in mercy offered a reward for lives of faithful service.

The grace we are now considering has clearly the promise of this life and the life to come.

1. It clearly has the Lord's promise of blessing in this life. Of course, it is not meant that beneficence will always ensure wealth. The Lord has set too low an estimate on wealth to offer it to his children as the reward of their obedience. And as many of his people already love it too well, it would be neither fatherly nor kind to bestow on them freely the very thing that would most endanger their salvation. The general tendency of the system, as we have already seen, is to promote industry, energy, and enterprise. It is, none the less, the effect of this system to promote sobriety in business and economy in living; to beget in the young Christian habits of fidelity, watchfulness, system, and exactness, and to restrain from hazardous adventures.

If now we turn to the word of God, we find it full of promises of temporal prosperity to the benevolent. In the argument which Paul makes to his Corinthian brethren on this subject, he says, "he who soweth bountifully shall also

reap bountifully. Every man, according as he purposeth in his heart, so let him give; not grudgingly, nor of necessity: for God loveth a cheerful giver." "And God is able to make all grace abound toward you; that ye always having all sufficiency in all things, may abound to every good work." Here the promised reward of giving is, that Christians shall have abundance to give more and more. With the greatest tenderness the Lord says, "thou shalt surely give thy poor brother, and thy heart shall not be grieved when thou givest unto him; because, that for this thing, the Lord thy God shall bless thee in all thy works, and in all thou putteth thy hand unto." "Honor the Lord with thy substance, and with all the fruits of thine increase; so shall thy barns be filled with plenty, and thy presses burst out with new wine." "He that hath pity on the poor, lendeth to the Lord, and that which he hath given him, will he repay him again." If these Scriptures be not devoid of meaning, they do teach us that the Lord does reward the liberality of his people in this life; that he does pay back their charities in kind.

2. Nor are we less clearly taught that the free exercise of this grace is rewarded in heaven. Gold and silver can not purchase heaven, but the Divine Teacher does not leave us to doubt, that his own people, who are saved by his blood, may greatly enhance their final reward by the proper use of their wealth on earth. One of the most marked features of the judgment day is, that the righteous are proved worthy to enter into the kingdom prepared for them from the foundation of the world, by the meat and drink and visits of mercy which they have bestowed on the least of the Lord's brethren on the earth. The Lord Jesus, after expounding the parable of the unjust steward, draws from it this lesson of warning and encouragement: "I say unto you, make unto yourselves friends of the mammon of unrighteousness, that when ye fail, they may receive you into everlasting habitations." According to the illustration contained in the parable, the Saviour teaches that when we have passed away from our earthly tabernacles, the poor and unfortunate, whose hearts we have gladdened by our charities while in the stewardship, are represented as standing with open arms to receive us into glory.

If this view of the teaching of the Scriptures be correct, what a blessed opportunity is given to those, to whom the Lord has given, many talents of wealth, to add new stores to their crown of rejoicing. Here is the true philosopher's stone, which converts the base metals of earth into the fine gold of heaven. But let not those to whom the Lord has given fewer talents fear, lest the rich may have greatly the advantage over them. For, the rule has already been established, "If there be first a willing mind, it is accepted, according to that a man hath, and not according to that he hath not." Where less is given, less will be required. If faithful over two talents, you shall be made ruler over two cities.

V. The Scriptures exhibit in the strongest terms, the dangers of refusing to exercise this grace of the Spirit. The opposite course of conduct invariably leads to covetousness, which is idolatry. We have not the space left to portray the dreadful effects of covetousness on Christian character; how it gradually converts the Christian into a robber, robbing his Maker, in tithes and offerings, robbing the widow and fatherless, the poor and distressed of the claim which God has given them on the benevolence of his people; how it uniformly leads to falsehood and wrong-doing; how it destroys natural feeling and tenderness of conscience; how it transforms many ministers of the gospel into mere place-hunters; how it is entirely inconsistent with the idea of redemption; how it conflicts with the constraining power of Christ's love over our souls. We have already shown that no covetous man hath any inheritance in the kingdom of God. Covetousness is the love of money; which "is the root of all evil." While God does reward the cheerful giver, he does as certainly punish the miser. "He that soweth sparingly, shall also reap sparingly." As the unjust steward was trusted long, and finally turned out of the stewardship for squandering on himself his Lord's goods; so will our Lord do, if we are unfaithful in his vineyard.

True, the Lord may not always take our possessions from us; for the sake of his covenant with us, or with our fathers, he may allow us to retain them during our lives; but he frequently takes them from our children, for whom we have so fondly

hoarded them. It has become a proverb in this country, that the rich of one generation are the poor of the next. How frequently does it happen, that the possessor of a hoarded estate is scarcely quiet in his grave before his treasures are scattered to the four winds. Or, if the Lord does not take away our possessions from our children, he frequently makes them a curse to those whom we intended to bless with them. The life of ease and luxury, which wealth engenders, unnerves the youth, and unfits him for that manly exertion, which is necessary to any great attainment. There are few more fatal errors than that parents can, by treasures gathered during their lives, secure their children happiness, independent of their own exertions. No character, nor reputation, is of any lasting value, that is not the result of the most thorough personal training and discipline. No man can either secure or long maintain himself in any position, which he did not win by his own exertions. Through labor and suffering, lies the only path to true greatness. In passing along this rugged pathway, much treasure is rather a hindrance, than a help. Let children be thoroughly educated (not filled with books), let them be well trained in the nurture and admonition of the Lord, let them be reared in habits of industry, and a very small portion of wealth will be sufficient for them. Without these virtues, no amount of wealth will long do them any good.

We have now given at least an outline view of some of the principal motives, which the Bible offers to Christians, to induce them to give largely of their substance, and fix high the proportion of their incomes to be devoted to the service of their Lord.

We are now prepared to appreciate, in its proper fullness, the Bible presentation of this whole subject. The Scriptures clearly prescribe a plan of systematic beneficence, full and minute in its details. The law is peremptory, universal in its application, requiring frequent and stated obedience, and fixing the measure of its exercise in proportion to the prosperity which God has bestowed on his people. Then, when the earnest inquirer desires to know definitely the meaning of the words, "as God hath prospered him;" when he asks

how high shall I fix my standard? how much shall I give? the Scriptures teach him that God is the only source of wealth; that he distributes his possessions to men according to his sovereign pleasure; that all property holders are merely the stewards of God; that the whole world, with all its possessions, has been given to the Mediator; that he in turn has bestowed his riches upon the church, his blood-bought bride, to be used by her for the glory of her Lord. Then, to encourage the church to do her whole duty in this behalf, her Divine Lord, pointing her to the system by which he trained his ancient people, with plainness teaches her, that Christian beneficence is of the very nature of true religion; that it always springs up in the heart where his Spirit dwells; then, as a crowning motive, which he knows her heart can not resist, he points to his own cross, and bids her measure her beneficence by her love to him. Our Divine King appeals to each of us, as the creatures of his hand, the pensioners on his bounty, as his stewards, to whom he has intrusted the resources of his kingdom; as blood-bought sinners, by our deliverance from hell, by our title to heaven, by our reward at the great day; in the name of our Creator, in the name of our daily Benefactor, in the name of our Redeemer King; to us, by all these resistless motives, he appeals, that as we abound in every grace, in faith and utterance, in knowledge and all diligence, and in our love to him, so we should abound in this grace also.

If now this be the correct teaching of the Scriptures in this regard, on what a different basis, then, does it place this whole subject of almsgiving from that on which it is commonly supposed to rest. Instead of being lords and masters of our possessions, doling out our pittance to the church according to our pleasure; we find ourselves simply the tenants of our Divine Lord, occupying till he come. It clearly shows us, that the Church of God is not the beggar she is popularly regarded; that the Saviour of the world is no beggar; that the ambassador of Christ, who comes and proclaims these truths from the statute book of the kingdom, and calls for the revenues of his Lord's government, is no beggar.

May we not, now, in conclusion, venture to urge this whole



subject more directly upon the careful and prayerful consideration of our Christian readers. We have purposely confined our attention, chiefly, to the teachings of the Bible, because we are writing for the Christian community. No Christian who has followed us through this article, can fail to see that something like the plan, which we have unfolded, is revealed in the word of God; and that the plan, whatever it be, comes to us with the sanction of divine authority. None may, therefore, refuse the discharge of this plain Christian duty, and be an obedient Christian.

How does it come to pass, then, that a system of Christian duty, so clearly revealed, of such vital importance to the success of Christ's cause, and enforced by the most powerful motives that can reach the human soul, is so generally neglected? To show that it is not generally practiced by Christians, needs but a glance at the annual reports of the boards of our church. Some of them report as many as one-half of the churches under the care of the General Assembly, as contributing nothing to their treasuries. Of course, if so many whole churches entirely neglect to take up collections, we may expect to find thousands of individuals, in churches which do give, wholly neglecting this divine command. And, of those churches and individuals, reported as contributing to the board, many of both have no systematic plan whatever. They give only when aroused to a spasmodic effort, by the visit of the agent of some board, or by a special effort of their pastor.

We earnestly entreat every Christian reader to adopt some scriptural plan of systematic beneficence, and continue to practice it through life. If the Lord has given you more than it is proper, in the light of this subject, for you to retain for yourself and family, then prayerfully consider how much of it this divine law may require you to devote to strengthening the endowment of some needy college, or feeble theological school, or to founding a library, or other charitable institution, that may continue to pour forth streams of blessing long after you have gone to your reward.

If, however, you determine that it is your duty to retain all, then, as all Christians of smaller means ought to do, settle



with yourself, as nearly as you can, your yearly, monthly, or weekly income as suits you best, think of Christ's love for your soul, and in view of all your circumstances, fix the proportion of it which you will give to your Saviour as high as your gratitude to him will allow; and never touch it for any other purpose. It is a sacrifice to God. Take from this sum as much as is necessary for the support of the gospel at home; then divide the remainder among the boards of your own church, and such other benevolent objects as you may think deserve your benefactions, according to your judgment of their relative importance, reserving a small balance for occasional calls. Whenever, therefore, a call is made, for a given cause, you know exactly how much you have to give to it. If your church neglect to make the collection when the proper time arrives, make your own donation and forward it to the proper destination, as you would offer you own prayers. How vast a change, in all our benevolent operations, would the adoption, by every Christian, of this simple system produce! No more pastor's salaries unpaid, how many weary laborers' hearts would be gladdened! How much swifter round every wheel of our King's chariot would fly! How much sooner the millennium would dawn!

We can not close, without assigning, with diffidence, however, one manifest cause of the general neglect of this important subject. This system of beneficence will never be carried extensively into operation, without the earnest effort and watchful care of ministers and church sessions. The teaching of Scripture, on this great theme, is but very imperfectly understood by many members of our church. It is the bounden duty of ministers to preach the whole will of God to men; nor can there be the least breach of modesty, in expounding the divine teaching on this subject. We do not ask ministers to beg (would they had never done so!), but only to make the people of God know and feel what he requires of them; and we vouch for the Lord's true people, that they will not long neglect their duty, after it is clearly understood.

But mere preaching is not sufficient. It requires the earnest, personal, persevering efforts of pastor and session, to

introduce such a system into a congregation. On the other hand, as soon as such efforts are made, they will, in great measure, be crowned with success. When a church is reported as contributing nothing to purposes of general benevolence, we generally expect to hear that, at least, only insufficient effort has been made by the pastor to instruct the people in their duty. When a minister has long had the religious instruction of a church in his hands, and, in the end, is starved away from it, we generally think that it is his own fault. No grace of the Divine Spirit is more cultivatable than Christian beneficence.

# VALUABLE BOOKS

PUBLISHED BY

## SMITH, ENGLISH & CO.,

### BOOKSELLERS, PUBLISHERS, AND IMPORTERS,

### No. 23 North Sixth St., Philadelphia.

- BIBLE ILLUSTRATIONS:** Being a Storehouse of Similes, Allegories, and Anecdotes, Selected from Spencer's "Things New and Old," and other Sources. With an Introduction by the Rev. RICHARD NEWTON, D.D. And a Copious Index. 12mo., Cloth.....\$1 25
- THE LAST TIMES, AND THE GREAT CONSUMMATION.** An Earnest Discussion of Momentous Themes. By JOSEPH A. SEISS, D.D., Author of "Gospel of Leviticus," "Lectures on Hebrews," "The parable of the Ten Virgins," etc. New and Enlarged Edition. 12mo., Cloth..... 1 25
- THOLUCK ON THE SERMON ON THE MOUNT.** Commentary on the Sermon on the Mount. By DR. A. THOLUCK. Translated by the Rev. E. Lundin Brown, M. A. 8vo., Cloth..... 2 50
- HENGSTENBERG ON ECCLESIASTES.** Commentary on the Book of Ecclesiastes. To which are appended Treatises on the Song of Solomon, on the Book of Job, on the Prophet Isaiah, on the Sacrifices of Holy Scripture, and on the Jews and the Christian Church. By E. W. HENGSTENBERG, D.D. Translated by D. W. Simon. 8vo., Cloth..... 2 25
- FLEMING'S VOCABULARY OF PHILOSOPHY.** A Vocabulary of Philosophy; Mental, Moral, and Metaphysical; with Quotations and References for the use of Students. By WILLIAM FLEMING, D.D., Professor of Moral Philosophy in the University of Glasgow; from the second, revised and enlarged, London edition, with additions. By CHARLES P. KRAUTH, D.D. 12mo., Cloth..... 1 88
- MOSHEIM'S COMMENTARIES.** Historical Commentaries on the state of Christianity during the first three hundred and twenty-five years of the Christian Era. By JOHN LAURENCE VON MOSHEIM, D.D. Translated and edited by James Murdock, D.D. 2 vols., 8vo., Cloth..... 4 00
- THOLUCK ON THE GOSPEL OF JOHN.** A Commentary on the Gospel of John. By DR. A. THOLUCK. Translated by Charles P. Krauth, D.D. 8vo., Cloth..... 2 25
- SCIENCE IN THEOLOGY.** Sermons preached in St. Mary's, Oxford, before the University. By A. S. FARRAR, M. A., etc. 12mo., Cloth..... 85
- PULPIT THEMES.** Pulpit Themes and Preachers' Assistant. Outlines of Sermons, by the Author of "Helps for the Pulpit." 12mo., Cloth..... 1 50
- GERLACH ON THE PENTATEUCH.** A Commentary on the Pentateuch. By OTTO VON GERLACH. Translated by the Rev. Henry Downing. 8vo., Cloth..... 3 00
- WINER'S IDIOMS.** A Grammar of the New Testament Diction, intended as an Introduction to the Critical Study of the Greek New Testament. By DR. GEORGE BENEDICT WINER. Translated from the Sixth Enlarged and Improved Edition of the Original, by Edward Mason, M.A. Second Edition, Revised. 8vo., Cloth..... 3 50
- SEISS' TEN VIRGINS.** The Parable of the Ten Virgins in Six Discourses. And a Sermon on the Judgeship of the Saints. By JOSEPH A. SEISS, D.D. 12mo., Cloth..... 75
- KURTZ'S CHURCH HISTORY.** Text-Book of Church History. Translated from the German of Professor JOHN HENRY KURTZ, D.D. 2 vols., Crown, 8vo. Vol. 1. To the Reformation, \$1 75. Vol. 2. From the Reformation..... 1 75
- CASES OF CONSCIENCE.** Religious Cases of Conscience answered in an Evangelical Manner. By the Rev. S. FIFE and the Rev. S. HAYWARD. New Edition, with an Introduction by the Rev. H. A. Boardman, D.D. 12mo., Cloth..... 1 25
- FAIRBAIRN'S HERMENEUTICS.** Hermeneutical Manual; or Introduction to the Exegetical study of the New Testament. By P. FAIRBAIRN, D.D. 12mo., Cloth..... 1 50
- HELPS FOR THE PULPIT:** or Sketches and Skeletons of Sermons. By a Minister. From the Fifth London Edition. 12mo., Cloth..... 1 50
- COLES ON GOD'S SOVEREIGNTY.** A Practical Discourse on God's Sovereignty, etc. By ELIZABETH COLES. From the Forty-Third London Edition. 12mo..... 75

# THE THEOLOGICAL ECLECTIC.

---

A SERIES of Theological Papers chiefly selected from the periodical and other literature of Great Britain, France, Germany and Holland.

**Published Monthly at \$1 per annum.**

This Journal, the first number of which was issued in May last, has been warmly welcomed by ministers and intelligent laymen of all evangelical denominations in every part of the loyal States. The following statements will show the new field it professes to occupy:

1. THE THEOLOGICAL ECLECTIC is designed to consist of choice theological papers, selected for the most part from the books, and also from some of the more important journals of Great Britain and the Continent, such as the British and Foreign Evangelical Review, British Quarterly Review, Journal of Sacred Literature, Christian Observer, Christian Remembrancer, the North British, London, Edinburgh and London Quarterly Reviews, Revue Chrétienne, Archives du Christianisme, Theologische Studien und Kritiken, Zeitschrift für die historische Theologie, Jahrbücher für deutsche Theologie, Allgemeine Kirchenzeitung, Protestantische Monatsblätter, Nieuwe Jaarboeken voor Wetenschappelijke Theologie, and Kerkhistorisch Archief.

2. In the selection of these papers, special prominence will be given to the vital question of the age, viz.: *a supernatural and authoritative revelation from a personal and living God*. Still the *Theological Eclectic* will not be restricted to this class of topics, but will contain articles on Biblical exposition, preaching, the lives of eminent theologians, and indeed on any subject in theology, not denominational, on which articles distinguished for their thought-developing power, and promising to aid ministers in their weekly preparation for the pulpit, are found. It is expected that these papers will be of such a character that intelligent laymen will read them with interest, but no attempt will be made to render this periodical popular in the common acceptance of the term.

3. The theological position represented in these papers will be the common Christianity of the Evangelical Churches. A wide latitude, however, will be allowed in the expression of individual opinion on subordinate questions.

4. The *Theological Eclectic* will be edited by Rev. George E. Day, Professor of Biblical Literature in Lane Seminary, with the privilege of consultation on any doubtful points, with BISHOP McILVAINE, DR. THOMPSON, NAST, and LYND, and Rev. H. M. STORRS, of the Protestant Episcopal, Presbyterian, Methodist, Baptist, and Congregational Churches.

5. This periodical will appear in monthly numbers, of not less than 24 pages each, and be printed in the style, as to form, type, and paper, of the North American Review. The subscription price for the year is \$1.00 per annum, *always strictly in advance*. The back numbers from the beginning of the year, in May, can be supplied.

WILLIAM SCOTT, *Publisher*,  
28 West Fourth Street, Cincinnati, O.

